

CROZER QUARTERLY

Volume XXVIII

October, 1951

Number 4

RELIGION AND REVOLUTION IN ASIA

EARL CRANSTON

University of Southern California

CIVILIZED man obviously confronts one of the greatest crises in history. New forces are at work, scientific, economic, political, psychological, and spiritual, capable of either making or breaking mankind. Dimly glimpsed as yet, they stand out like shadows in a fog, appearing in many cases more terrifying than they actually are. To comprehend and master these trends and powers is the major task of the years immediately ahead, particularly of the sixth decade of the twentieth century. In this creative process many time-honored objectives and techniques will prove ineffective and outmoded. Much of the present confusion appears due to the fact that humanity has become disillusioned and is uncertain as to where to turn. One may at once posit a tentative solution: in this extremity, as often in the past, religion may point the way to the answer and even supply it.

Moral crises are not new to our time. More than a score of years ago just before the stock market crash a considerable proportion of our people faced their age with the open cynicism so well portrayed by Walter Lippmann, whose *Preface to Morals* viewed accepted folkways and religious values as being dissolved by "the acids of modernity." A reëxamination of religion ensued, the social and spiritual conscience of this nation was proved in fires of depression and war, and religion, whether liberal or of a more orthodox theological trend, regained something of its dynamic, revived the faith and life of millions, and served as a strong factor in carrying us on through V-E Day and Hiroshima to the apparent victory which has proved not to be a triumph after all.

A new age began with the dropping of atom bombs for the purposes of destruction. It was we who launched the bombs which fell in the Orient; it is in that whole Far Eastern region, set out in livid brightness by the explosions with all their baffling premonitions, that man seems likely to lose or to find his soul and his culture in these critical years.

Because this era is yet so new and its events have been so baffling, we have become haunted by fear, and foreboding—a lack of confidence due no doubt in part to what some would consider a social guilt complex, which has puffed itself up to colossal proportions like those of the ascending gaseous umbrellas which rise as the aftermath of our atomic explosions. Even before the invasion of South Korea, John Foster Dulles observed in

War or Peace: "Something has gone wrong with our nation, or we should not be in our present plight and mood. It is not like us to be on the defensive and to be fearful. That is new in our history. The trouble is not material. We are establishing an all-time world record in the production of material things. What we lack is a righteous and dynamic faith. Without it, all else avails us little."

One-half year later, when the Chinese communists were openly fighting in Korea, this noncommunistic uneasiness had reached such a pitch that the trumpet gave an uncertain sound at the White House, the Pentagon, Toyko, and the draft boards. Students were dropping out of schools and colleges by tens of thousands for reasons which they themselves could not validate. And a brilliant Oriental analyst, Miss Sarah Chakko, president of Isabella Thoburn College in Lucknow, India, could declare:

Perhaps the most dominating factor that strikes the newcomer to Europe and America is that of FEAR—fear of atomic weapons, fear of totalitarian ideologies, fear of economic collapse, fear of the unknown future. This fear has reached the verge of paralysis.

It would be rash to attempt any certain prediction, but there may be reason to believe that the worst of the smog wave of fear has passed, and that regardless of what may lie ahead free men must cease to fear and drift. They must rather reassert their confidence in themselves, in God, and the fundamental moral structure of the universe.

More fully than any other human resource is religion able to accomplish this transformation of outlook and action. In 1950 religion as conceived and practiced did not measure up to its responsibility. Hence the fear. But the religion of ensuing years, with eyes open to reality, can give a better account of itself. The Christian's present need becomes that of viewing his world as it is, without seeking escapes or self-deception, and then of seeing it as it might be.

This examination will centre upon the Orient, especially China, for, as John Hay asserted five decades ago, "Whoever understands that mighty Empire—socially, politically, economically, religiously—has the key to world politics for the next five centuries."

Only about one tenth of that period has passed, but it appears that at the present time few persons have found or used John Hay's key. For the more one knows about the not-so-inscrutable Chinese, the more he becomes convinced that most Occidentals do not understand them. This situation applies to the majority of officials and diplomats in the various foreign offices and state departments of Western or Occidental governments. The foreign policy of the United States, for example, even in the twentieth century, has been formed and administered largely by presidents, secretaries of state, and other functionaries whose training, interest, and experience centred largely upon Europe and slighted Asia. Well may

Americans heed the often-repeated injunction of Nehru and Toynbee that the West blunders and suffers because it is not cognizant of the history, conditions, and psychology of the East. Toynbee observes that for the average Westerner, the Oriental ceases to be a "native" only when he can manipulate a tank. Politics, diplomacy, and the military arm of government have much to learn in regard to Asia. Meanwhile, a sympathetic religious outlook, and a willingness to accept spiritual values in other faiths, may supply the best means for bridging the gap. The Orient of both today and of yesterday must be scrutinized and appreciated.

Asia is currently being swept by several social or political waves. One of these is a tremendous increase in population. The number of persons in areas like the Philippines and Java more than doubles in half a century; in Japan and India it doubles in thirty or thirty-five years. There are some 600,000,000 people in Southeast Asia, Indonesia, and India, and an equal number north of that region, or one half of the population of the world in the eastern two thirds of Asia and its tributary islands. This population is largely non-Christian and increases with a rapidity far beyond that of the regions in which Christianity is dominant. And it is becoming nationally conscious and assertive, demanding political power and global influence. It can easily control world affairs in the twenty-first century. If it be indifferent or hostile toward Christianity, that faith will find itself in a far less enviable position than it held in the Golden Age from 1815 to 1914 which Professor Kenneth S. Latourette has termed "The Great Century." Yet for the most part American Christians are still following the religious thought patterns and axioms of that pre-World War I period. These forms may already be outmoded. Rethinking is surely in order.

Other contemporary Oriental movements, like nationalism, racial consciousness, and industrialization, adjust themselves to and ride into power on another major current wave, that of revolution. Americans traditionally have welcomed revolution. They inherited that zest from the uprisings of their Puritan ancestors; through it they won independence from Britain; on the whole they approved of the French Revolution of 1789 and even more generally of the popular European revolutions of the nineteenth century, particularly that of 1848. Twentieth-century liberal revolutions have tended to occur in Asia rather than in Europe, and have been less fully noted and applauded in America. Turkey in 1908 and later, China in 1911 and 1925, and India and Indonesia and other regions since 1945 have with variations followed the older European pattern of liberal revolution. On the other hand, many twentieth-century European revolutions, like those which brought into power the fascists, nazis, falangists, and communists, have been conservative, and have restrained freedom and political and civil liberties, resorting to oppression, terror, and violence.

No wonder the late Everett Dean Martin as far back as 1935 in an

outstanding classic, *Farewell to Revolution*, asserted that Americans and other lovers of liberty have since 1917 tended to abhor revolution because it seemed conservative and repressive. America, furthermore, tends now to stand for the status quo. In regard to European totalitarian revolutions such an attitude may appear cogent, but Americans may be deluding themselves into an oversimplification if they blandly assume that all contemporary revolutions are conservative, authoritarian, and oppressive, and therefore worthy of rejection. May it not be that the recent and current flood of Asiatic revolutions is more liberal than is often imagined, and that it foreshadows the wave of the future? If so, it demands study. Such an examination may well permit the West to adjust itself to the present and often inchoate Oriental urge for change and revolution, and even to direct it by imparting better techniques and ends. If Western tradition, experience, and maturity afford any precedents and values, these Oriental revolutions should be comprehended, and possibly channeled, without further delay.

Our forebears have followed an inconsistent and wavering course toward Oriental peoples, governments, and revolutions. The Taiping Rebellion in China just one hundred years ago, for all its differences, bears certain curious resemblances to the present Chinese revolution, particularly if the latter be viewed from its indigenous side rather than from the angle of Russian influence upon it. Both these Chinese revolutions have posed as grass-roots movements, under humble leaders fired by a mission and a reckless idealism, however valid or misguided. Both have ebbed and flowed over wide reaches of space and time. Both promised and gave initial reforms; both were hailed with enthusiasm by many Westerners in China and abroad. Gradually American and British sympathy for each revolution declined as its rulers appeared more arbitrary and tyrannical, and more unable or unwilling to lift the burdens of the common man. The Taipings whose would-be king called himself "the younger brother of Jesus Christ" professed an ideology grotesquely akin to that of Christianity; the communists hold a kinship to Karl Marx. The communists are subject to world-wide relationships and pressures unknown to the Taipings. Even more than was the case with the Taiping Rebellion, which was put down by the Chinese government reënforced by foreign aid, the fate of the communist revolution in China may be determined not merely by internal forces but by the policies and actions of other peoples. It would be foolish and tragic to permit the Russians to be the only ones to exercise that determinative rôle.

Before attempting to prognosticate the fate of China's present revolution, it is advisable to interpret some essential historical facts and psychological trends which bulk large in China but are too often overlooked on our side of the Pacific.

For four thousand years the Chinese have been a democratic people, each rural or urban community managing most of its own affairs according to accepted principles. The central government was often more a form than an actuality; when it became corrupt or extravagant and ceased to serve the people, it was held to have "forfeited the Mandate of Heaven" and to be due for a change. A decadent dynasty would be replaced by a virile one headed by a noble, a scholar, a farmer, or in one case a Buddhist priest. Often the change was effected with a minimum of violence, as was the case in Britain's Glorious Revolution of 1688.

A foreign-trained physician, Sun Yat-Sen, headed the revolution of 1911-1912 which overthrew the last dynasty and set up the Chinese Republic which received strong moral and political support from the United States and other foreign governments. For in that day liberal revolutions were still popular in the West. That Chinese Republic experienced many difficulties, particularly when in its third year World War I broke out and the belligerents fought on Chinese soil. It was so weak in the mid-1920's that a new revolutionary wave swept it, led by Dr. Sun's lieutenant Chiang Kai-Shek, then viewed by many Westerners as a dangerous radical, possibly even as a communist. For several years the United States, Great Britain, and other democracies hesitated to endorse this movement, and thereby lost an opportunity to become unquestioned friends of an aspect of the Chinese revolution which proved itself a beneficial force for well over a decade.

The astute Russians, on the other hand, lost no time in proclaiming themselves the boon supporters of the Chinese and their revolution. They removed the unequal treaties which the tsars had imposed upon China; they alone among Westerners officially marched in the funeral procession of Sun Yat-Sen. In various ways they endorsed and sought to direct successive phases of the revolution which was to last for decades. Admit that the communists were prompted by ulterior motives; they recognized trends and made the most of the lead which they gained. The United States and Britain ultimately mounted the bandwagon, the progress of which they had for a time retarded.

Throughout the 1930's and down to 1945 when Generalissimo and Madame Chiang were at the height of their influence, the Chinese revolution was in its most constructive stage. The Chiangs received the enthusiastic support of the Western democracies and were lauded throughout the English-speaking world. During this period, and even for a few years before it, Chinese Christians were assuming an increasingly large share in directing and unifying the Protestant movement in their country, although denominational differences and institutional inertia, stemming more from foreigners than from the Chinese, slowed down the development of a fully indigenous church.

By 1945, with Allied victory impending, the United States had the opportunity to support and be supported by the liberal movements of most of Asia. A great debate was going on as to whether the provisions of the Atlantic Charter applied to Asia. Neither the Americans nor the British fully grasped the opportunity to put themselves at the head of the forces proclaiming freedom for all the Orient. We forgot that we could win a war and lose a peace. As usual the adroit communists exploited the situation with amazing effectiveness. Democracy's shortsighted lethargy again became communism's opportunity.

Here Korea enters the picture. Most Americans did not regard that ill-starred peninsula as a basic factor in world affairs until June 25, 1950. Even devout churchmen, sincere supporters of Christian missions, had usually neglected to brief themselves on the basic elements of Korean history. For the last three thousand years the Chinese have looked upon Korea as a part of China. The first Korean dynasty, which lasted for a millennium, was begun by a Chinese noble who migrated to the peninsula when a Chinese dynasty fell in the legendary date of 1122 B.C. The Korean kings were vassals of the Chinese emperors, Japan, rising toward world power, fought China over Korea in 1894 and won an easy victory. In 1904-1905, again with Korea and adjacent Manchuria as causes, Japan defeated Tsarist Russia and took over large leases and rights which Russia had extorted from China. As a military measure Japan had occupied Korea. President Theodore Roosevelt allowed Japan to remain there at war's end; a few years later his successor, William Howard Taft, warmly accepted the formal incorporation of Korea into the Japanese Empire. Free Korea disappeared from the map in our lifetime, with our approval. Americans paid little attention to this step of supposed expediency in world politics, but the Koreans and Chinese were confused.

When the Chinese communists entered the undeclared war against the United Nations in North Korea in November 1950, most Americans expressed surprise, although the sombre, measured words of commentators like Elmer Davis and Edward R. Murrow revealed that a minority of well-informed interpreters were aware of implications and potentialities. For, amazing as it may seem to the average citizen of Kokomo or Fresno, communist propaganda chose to blare throughout China that what Americans were construing as the march of United Nations troops to the Yalu was not a movement advancing liberation, democracy, and unity, but was an imperialistic invasion by United States soldiers who had used their defeat of one Oriental people, the Japanese, as a steppingstone for the attempted conquest of continental Asia.

Communist propagandists could point out that the Japanese had made three major attempts to invade Asia through Korea. One trial, between A.D. 663 and 668 was thwarted when Chinese troops of the glorious

T'ang dynasty helped the Koreans to expel the foreigners. A more serious effort was launched by the Japanese dictator Hideyoshi between 1592 and 1598. He sent wave after wave of ships to Korea, only to meet defeat from Korean and Chinese forces. The Koreans invented a primitive ironclad, with a spiked tortoise-shell superstructure to repel the invaders. Just ten years after Queen Elizabeth's hardy mariners, aided by storms, had dispersed the attacking Armada of Philip II of Spain, the aging and discouraged Hideyoshi lying on his deathbed is said to have whispered to his successor Iyeyasu, "Bring back my troops, lest they become ghosts in Korea." Iyeyasu, a practical man destined to become the first Tokugawa shogun, complied, and the menace to Korea was again averted.

The final Japanese invasion from 1904 to 1945 likewise failed. But Korea passed not into the traditional hands of China, nor into a unified free republic, but into two protectorates, one dominated by the shrewd old bear who alternately appeared as friend and menace and one sponsored by the eagle from across the seas. To be sure the Americans removed their troops in 1949, but the average Chinese who had access only to communist propaganda was not aware of that fact. To him the Yankee was aggressively climbing up the Korean ladder just as the Japanese soldier had done, crossing the thirty-eighth parallel, threatening the Yalu River where Japan had won a victory in the Russo-Japanese War, after which she, like Joshua long ago, had crossed the river into the Promised Land.

However irrelevant or prosaic this historical recital may appear to the casual American, it is tremendously important to the Chinese, the Koreans, and all inhabitants of Asia who are in flux between oppression and freedom.

Our Korean campaign is represented to Orientals as the culmination of a sinister policy begun by the United States more than six years ago in the unethical secret Yalta agreement made by Franklin Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin a few weeks before the late president's death. Most Americans don't know about Yalta. Those who do would like to forget it. At Yalta Russia promised to enter the war against Japan for a price; she would become heir to the Japanese privileges in Manchuria which should have reverted to China. She would obtain also certain minor but strategically located Japanese islands, and such military and economic footholds in northeastern Asia that it became easy for her subsequently to help establish the Chinese communists as rulers of North China and hasten the downfall of Chiang Kai-Shek. It is now evident that Yalta was a practical as well as a moral error, for Japan was on the point of being defeated by the Allies without any need for Russian aid. Soviet entrance into the Oriental war two days after the atom bomb fell on Hiroshima and one week before Japan openly asked for peace did more harm than good to the cause of democracy and unity; yet Russia has successfully

convinced much of Asia that she is the power responsible for Japan's defeat.

The Chinese were not consulted at Yalta, nor did they or the Koreans have a part in later agreements under which Russia obtained her hold on North Korea. Although the American government has sought to justify these decisions on the grounds of military necessity and diplomatic expediency, Asiatics tend to consider them disastrous and iniquitous. Those among them who know their history place two Democratic presidents, Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman, in the same category as the two Republican presidents, the earlier Roosevelt and Taft, as chief executives who would sacrifice the integrity and freedom of Korea and China for the supposed welfare of America and some strong military associate, Japan in the earlier instance, the Soviet Union in the more recent one. Neither political party has indicated any conspicuous remorse, but it appears clear that the Chinese and Korean movements for liberation and freedom were retarded rather than advanced by these American actions.

To crown the perplexing abandonment of our professed friendship, the Orientals affirm that our Chinese policy in the decisive years at the end of World War II was directed too largely by three American generals, Stilwell, Hurley, and Marshall. American opportunity deteriorated when it needed to advance. The Voice of America which should have been strong enough to counter communist propaganda never rose above what one observant senator has termed a "whisper," retarded by the red tape of the State Department and lack of appropriations by Congress. In the late 1940's we were indeed forfeiting the peace which had so recently fallen into our hands.

At this same time, for various reasons for some of which we cannot escape responsibility, the government of Chiang Kai-Shek had lost the confidence of the Chinese people and had "forfeited the Mandate of Heaven." A more intelligent policy on the part of the democracies might have helped Chinese liberals—business and professional men, returned students, diplomats and civil servants, labor leaders, and others—to build up a Third Force, which might take over the direction of China's peaceful revolution, saving it from Chiang's Kuomintang on the one hand and the communists on the other. But no such substitute party was available, and the communists prevailed. Whether he liked it or not, the Chinese farmer, merchant, or student, and often the Christian, had to walk with the crowd, rub his hands, stifle his misgivings, and hope for the best. Americans took little note of this dilemma, but Orientals, especially those in awakening South Asia, observed, and acted accordingly. They became less certain that America would prove their sponsor as they moved toward freedom. They found little evidence that a strong Christian conscience was demanding for the pulsing Orient the guarantees of human dignity

and spiritual reality which are traditionally associated with this prophetic faith. Religious sanctions seemed strangely lacking; ignorance and lethargy appeared to rule in their place. While we fiddled or fumed, China fell to the communists.

The Chinese, basically so like us in ideals, reactions, climate, and resources, who should now be our best friends in the East, have in these latter years become suspicious of our policies, actions, and intentions, even of our religion. It is now hard to be a Christian in China. Typical of the quandary which engulfs the missionaries is a letter from a liberal Protestant who has effectively served thirty years in China. He reports that nearly all his associates are departing. For, says he, "Remaining here would prove a serious embarrassment to the church. The church must live under this new regime which is abnormally suspicious of the missionaries, constantly referring to us as spies, agents of our governments. It is a hard blow to give up lifelong friendships and to be torn away from the work. But our leaving is the part of wisdom and kindness."

Even more difficult is the plight of the Chinese Christians. At first many of them trusted that the communist revolution might bring liberty and reform. It is human nature to expect the best of a change, especially if it comes with high promises and professions. Chinese Christians, joined at times by missionaries, issued manifestos of hope, obviously with sincerity. They saw evils in society which needed to be replaced by something better. Some tried to reconcile Christianity and communism, to purge the latter of its materialism and violence, to infuse it with spirituality. There is reason to believe that the enthusiasm of many of these Christians has languished in recent months, when glamour fades and injustice and intolerance and the police state become more obvious. Many manifestos which now appear, unless they are old ones just released, may be due in large part to pressure put upon the signers or their families, friends, and constituencies. Compulsion and disillusionment may be expected to increase.

From the relative security of a berth across the seas, the American Christian can observe that this fiery trial, like all tests and persecutions of Christians through the ages, may be expected to purify the faith. But who is satisfied with a situation under which his fellows of any tongue or race must be thus proved? What responsibility do we as privileged though indifferent friends have for permitting such a condition to arise? What can we do to remedy it? For we may be confident that here, as always, there can be redemption and regeneration, both material and spiritual.

Korea presents much the same picture. This land, furthermore, has suffered phenomenal destruction. Some of its fields and cities have been fought over four or more times. Refugees and orphans are so common that they are hardly noticed by our troops along the roads; their pictures

no longer create more than a passing impression in our papers or at our theatres. An undue proportion of Korean Christian leaders has been liquidated; others are under arrest or intimidated. Korean Christianity, always in its Protestant form more orthodox, naïve, and trusting than that of most of the Orient, bears well its deadly persecution, but a world-wide atonement for and restoration of that unhappy land is long overdue.

Encouragement and guidance may be derived from the fact that in certain other Oriental areas the upheavals are presently more intelligently channeled. Japan benefits from reconstruction and an experiment in democracy and liberal education. Christianity is said to be attracting the sympathetic interest of persons from all walks of life. A cultured Philadelphia woman, a member of the Society of Friends, has served as tutor to the crown prince. Japanese churches are manifesting new life. Pastor Tamimoto, hero of John Hersey's *Hiroshima*, tours the United States and wins a marked response. A Japan International Christian University is in the process of organization; unlike the Americans, the Japanese themselves long ago oversubscribed their financial quota for the undertaking. These developments can scarcely be classified as revolutionary in the accepted sense of the term, but they look genuine. If properly understood and supported by Christians and other men of good will around the globe, they may prove lastingly constructive and normative even after the American occupation terminates. They may become one of the pioneer ways in which the contemporary Oriental revolution will influence the Western world.

In Iran, the proposal of the shah to divide his vast royal estates among peasant farmers has aroused interest and hope. Even though this action be paternalistic, like certain spectacular acts of Europe's eighteenth-century enlightened despots, it appears productive of good, a move calculated to advance democracy and make communist inroads appear less attractive. The shah's ability to observe widely and live zestfully on his recent visit to the United States may have been a factor in causing this reform.

On the other side of the ledger, attention must be given to areas where today's revolution poses problems. Indo-China, as is well known, is rent by a civil war of ill omen, with the French imperialists attempting to maintain their hold by supporting their native monarch, while communist aid from outside seeks to install a rival potentate who presumably would extend the Iron Curtain around his domain. This conflict, one of the most uninspiring imaginable, leaves much to be desired on both sides. Yet it is a matter of world concern, calling for adjustment by means other than prejudice or war. It is difficult to believe that the United States could emerge with effectiveness and dignity were it to become a military party to this struggle. Yet powerful forces are seeking to effect that objective. If this Indo-China unrest can be directed to constructive and liberal ends, presumably by the people themselves, without resulting in

imperialism or totalitarianism, humanity can breathe more safely. America's eventual contribution to this troubled zone may lie in creative measures not yet imagined.

A clue to these newer techniques for international coöperation in settling local conflicts came in February, 1951. The restoration of the recently deposed king of Nepal, high on the border of India, was conditioned upon the calling of a popularly elected assembly to draft a new constitution. This happy outcome was the result of mediation and specific proposals by the most outstanding of contemporary Oriental statesmen, Prime Minister Nehru of India. He successfully assumed the rôle of restoring peace and justice to his neighbors under a formula in which reason triumphed over violence.

This encouraging action is characteristic of various peaceful victories accomplished by Nehru during his less than four years in office. Most notable was his instrumentality in ending the war between the Indonesian revolutionaries and their Dutch overlords. Summoning to New Delhi the representatives of some twenty countries ranging from Egypt to Australia and New Zealand, the resourceful Nehru stimulated the evolution of a plan under which the Indonesian republic became a reality with the blessing of The Netherlands. Recently it was admitted to the United Nations as its sixtieth member. Such heartening steps point the way to the eventual liberation and stabilization of Asia; they indicate that peaceful measures may succeed where violence and war can only fail.

Nehru's unique rôle would have been impossible were it not that he follows, however realistically and by degrees, the injunctions, methods, and spirit of his late friend and master, Mahatma Gandhi. The latter successfully introduced new outlooks and techniques into world affairs. Ignoring the time-honored rules of statecraft, without financial, economic, or military resources, or the tremendous build-up of heavy industry common to the struggle for power, he relied only upon ideas, character, and the nonviolent action of millions who caught his vision. In this strange way he won freedom for nearly one-half a billion people in India and Pakistan; even the British overlords were gratified by this solution, one of the paradoxes of all time. When violence broke out between the religious groups in the two new states, Gandhi reconciled that Hindu-Moslem strife, but, like Lincoln before him, his magnanimity led to his assassination at the hour of victory. Yet he had introduced into the world scene a method of action which may ultimately prove more effective and popular than war. He had vindicated the Asiatic impulse for revolution by directing it according to religious and ethical principles. It is reasonable to suggest that in the full perspective of history he, rather than Churchill or Roosevelt, will be considered the greatest figure of the last half century.

Nehru of course is not Gandhi, nor does he act only according to his master's methods. He does, however, assert that morality underlies statecraft, that the lot of the common man must be bettered by new as well as by time-honored means, and that reconciliation and peace outweigh incrimination and war. He is seeking new ventures rather than defending an old order; thereby he qualifies as a leader for contemporary Asia. It is natural that he should strive to end the Korean struggle. His specific proposals may not be unquestionably the best. But what leader is infallible? Americans do not even assign that virtue to their own President. The undercurrent of criticism against Nehru because New Delhi does not follow meekly the thought patterns of Washington is shortsighted. New light is needed: it may break out in the land which has produced many saints and sages. The American public would do well to ponder upon a letter from Philip Randolph, international president, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, printed in the *New York Times* on January 29, 1951. "The United States," writes Mr. Randolph, "should ponder the statement of Nehru that 'all the troubles in the Far East arise from the failure of the world to adjust itself to changes which have taken place in Asia.' A new power exists in Asia, and that fact should be recognized. If the Western democracies lose Nehru as a collaborator and interpreter of the Eastern mind they will be left without the most powerful force for peace and democracy today." Here speaks a voice which represents the working men of more than one continent, one which suggests that no single racial group, however large, can any longer assume to dominate world thought and action.

As if to substantiate the thesis of Gandhi and Nehru that mediation and concession can apply even between religious factions, there stands a second recent Asiatic triumph for conciliation in Palestine. Three years ago many authorities expected a world war to arise out of the Jewish-Moslem tension in the Holy Land. The United Nations assumed jurisdiction, employing a commission of investigation and mediation under the public-spirited Count Folke Bernadotte of Sweden. His martyrdom, within a few months of that of Gandhi, etched before the world the magnitude of his task and spirit. The successful termination of the struggle was effected under his successor, Dr. Ralph Bunche, a California scholar and international servant who transcends racial barriers and, like Bernadotte, belongs to that increasingly significant company who foreshadow the world citizens of the future.

What lessons do all these tendencies and developments hold for Christianity, present and potential, in Asia and throughout the world? Obviously Christianity stands in a critical position, able to adjust and persist, possibly in purer form than ever before, capable also of maladjustment, frustration, and even defeat or disintegration. The Christian faith

can be retarded by the domination in Asia of either of two forces, each of great strength but doubtful validity.

One of these forces is materialistic Marxist communism, indifferent to or openly hostile to religion. Christianity, Buddhism, Taoism, Hinduism, Islam, and the rest of the Asiatic religions face a common threat. Their survival may depend upon whether they stand together with a common front, or whether they ignore and disparage one another, in which case communism may eliminate them one by one much as Hitler picked off individually but successively the free states with which he came in contact. One hundred years ago it was common for Christians to denounce other faiths as heathen or superstitious; regrettably even much support of the missionary movement stemmed from that motive. But the spread of Christianity does not necessarily mean the decline of some other religion; Christian gains often revive and strengthen other faiths. Conversely, a decline in Buddhism may not strengthen Christianity but may indicate or precipitate a parallel decline in Christianity. The Christian faith and other high religions hold many common values and objectives. From various angles all the major faiths should encourage and support one another and the religious hopes of the common people of Asia. Religion has recently proved its vitality in India: Christian reinforcement of Hinduism can strengthen a welcome alternative to communism, and bring to the people many basic Christian beliefs and experiences. Were communism to triumph, its materialistic ideology with its violence, class struggle, disregard for moral values, would leave a bitter, cynical, discordant East, restless under an imposed totalitarianism. Communism's victory in Asia would not be permanent; it would be a yoke which should not and need not be imposed. Religious faith, well alerted and broadly tolerant, offers the best security against this threat.

The second menace which could retard Christianity in Asia is militarism and imperialism. These twin forces have plagued the faith since Constantine gave it his ill-omened patronage. Russia is not the only power which at present kneels before these idols; even though their day is nearly done, we too may worship at their shrine. If we do that in Asia, we turn the clock back. Americans do well at this moment to ponder what one of their prophets, Wendell Willkie, learned eight years ago when after his global tour at the height of World War II he wrote in *One World*:

Men and women all over the world are on the march, physically, intellectually and spiritually. After centuries of dull compliance hundreds of millions of people in Asia have opened the books. They are no longer willing to be Eastern slaves for Western profits. They are resolved, as we must be, that there is no more place for imperialism within their society than in the family of nations. The big house on the hill surrounded by mud huts has lost its awesome charm.

These sentences represent the United States at its best. But if in our frantic search for security we so militarize ourselves that we create

a new imperialism, we shall have betrayed our trust. We must rather assume the leadership in the human pilgrimage away from imperialism and war. There are signs that we can do this. Strangely reminiscent of Willkie's world-girdling trip has been a recent global tour by Justice William O. Douglas of the United States Supreme Court. Writing in *Look* magazine for January 16, 1951, under the title "We Can't Save Asia by War Alone," Justice Douglas asserts that we must have far more than military action to combat communism in Asia, particularly to appeal to the illiterate peasants who welcome revolution as an escape from their plight.

Money is not so much needed [he declares] as ideas. If we openly undertake to manage these revolutions, we will at once enlist the support and enthusiasms of the peoples of this area. We will for the first time be identified with them and their struggles for liberty, not in words, but in action. That would be a welcome relief. American missionaries and American educators have shown the selflessness of which America is capable. What we must do is to direct, not destroy, the revolutions. And it will take an imaginative, creative undertaking—not a military one—to do it.

This appeal is one which should readily be grasped by the Christian conscience.

Assuming that Americans accept their rightful political, educational, and spiritual rôle in proclaiming freedom for Asia, what may be expected, in regard to China, for instance? One possibility is that despotism may nevertheless increase and continue there indefinitely. Those who know the Chinese find it hard to believe that this could be the case. More consistent with the age-long Chinese character is the thesis that if the democracies vindicate themselves, the Chinese communists will gradually disassociate themselves from Russia, and even break with her. Recent British policy has assumed the possibility that the Chinese may out-Tito Tito. Domestically they may in due time remove the elements of totalitarianism, espionage, and the police state, and the Chinese people again may be free. Another possibility is that the burden of trying to rule all China, with floods, shortages, famines, heavy taxes, repressions, and internal disturbances, to say nothing of losses of man power and materials in such ventures as the Korean war, may so weigh down the Peking government that like other administrations, both before and since the proclamation of the republic, it may fall from weakness or revolution. Even communism cannot defy the "Mandate of Heaven." The change will come more quickly if democracy and religion in other lands appear dynamic, disinterested, and reasonable. In the long run the Chinese will insist upon liberty; we should be sympathetic, not disconsolate, in regard to the present crisis.

Meanwhile the United States would seem well advised to seek peace rather than war with the Chinese. To some of us who were teachers and missionaries in China it seems fantastic to see our sons trained to fight

our friends and the sons of our friends. What then will happen to the Christianity we have jointly professed? Walter Lippmann has recently written that the Korean war is conducted in an artificial environment; that it is a cloak for the basic quarrel between Russia and the United States. He believes the military phase in Korea to be approaching a stalemate. When this fact is recognized "the fighting must decrease in intensity until somehow at long last a *de facto* cease-fire prevails." It is not to the interest of either this country or China to fight each other. If we can extricate ourselves from Korea with justice and dignity, we may well determine never again to have American soldiers fight upon the continent of Asia, that immense stretch of fields, mountains, and deserts, which no external power can ever fully conquer. Relations with Orientals we must have, to an increasing degree. Our contribution, however, and that of the United Nations lies less in the imposition of military force than in the power of ideas and educational economic service.

It now become appropriate to consider the effect of Asia's revolutions and religion upon American modes of thought and conduct. For the process in which we are involved operates definitely in both directions; it is a two-way street. Surely this country can no longer live as it did before the force of present realities dawned upon it.

The new Asia challenges us to chart and follow a positive program combining intelligent governmental action and a reassertion and revitalization of the Jewish and Christian faiths, beginning with a change of heart as vigorous as that which came to the exiles who looked up from the discouragement of the waters of Babylon to hear the prophet say, "Comfort ye, my people," followed by words suggesting specific constructive steps for social betterment.

In like manner the Asiatic tumult summons us to honest action for the advancement of racial equality. How can America ask justice for minorities abroad, if she denies it at home? Such a dramatic act as the appointment of Ralph Bunche to the office of Secretary of State, or of chief of Korean reconstruction, would be of more influence in the Orient than the dispatching of ten military divisions.

Politically it is no one's especial fault that America has no Jefferson, Lincoln, or Wilson to lead her to national dedication. But her Christian people can insist that both political parties habitually nominate men and women of highest ability, integrity, and experience as candidates for all responsible governmental offices in Washington—executive and legislative.

In the economic realm, if we would advance world stability, Asiatics will expect us to prove able to control our own wage and price levels. The placing of personal or group interests above the welfare of the nation as a whole will convince Asiatics that they cannot count upon us. Wages at \$4 per hour and steak at \$1.75 per pound are not conducive to peace in Korea or justice in Indo-China. This is a moral issue. How inconsistent

it is to denounce selfishness in the abstract, but condone it in common practice. The graph of the ascending price curve may be as relevant as is the thirty-eighth parallel.

The Asiatic situation indeed supplies a new imperative for enlightened social action by American Christian. Education and self-discipline are indispensable. Publicists, social analysts, teachers, and conscientious public servants must be honored and encouraged, not slandered. The stream of new scholars must be kept flowing in abundance, for victory in the Asiatic struggle depends more upon brains and integrity than upon arms. The colleges and universities are this country's most strategic training grounds for meeting the Asiatic crisis. Any draft proposal which would empty them of young men, or reduce enrollments to a pitiful fraction, would weaken the proficiency of the youth, the colleges, and the country, and probably would not even achieve the intended national security. Such action would imperil America's ultimate welfare and safety. The Oriental crisis demands the keeping of American higher education at the top pitch of universality and of realistic effectiveness.

Conspicuous among subjects to be taught to the youth who will control the future are the languages, history, institutions, and psychology of all Asiatic peoples and of the Russians. How much more efficient would the American soldier in Korea be if he had more adequate knowledge of that mystifying land. And he would be less liable to become a casualty. If the American public knew their Orient better, their policies would be more valid and successful.

Oriental realities demand also a revamping and reassertion of American religious faith. No more can one quibble over subtleties within Christianity or between the faiths. Even infant damnation and the Assumption of the Virgin fade into the background in view of the glare of a needlessly burned city; or of that embodiment of the recurring cross, an idealistic youth of any race dying upon a battlefield to which he should never have been sent. Theology and dogma can and should become more creatively significant and vital; experts can wrestle with their strictures and symbols, but beyond and out in front of the theological framework must move a corporate yearning to search out and express the heart of Christian revelation and experience in terms meaningful to the common man in all lands. The new Protestant revolution, of which seekers like Paul Tillich have dreamed, may thus become a reality.

The great religions of Asia will be studied more fully, that Lao Tse and the Sermon on the Mount may reënforce each other, and Mo Ti's zeal for mutual love and universal peace may bring power and illumination to the prophets and Jesus. Just as Clement and his Alexandrian students infused the knowledge and faith of classic and hellenistic religious values into a synthesis with formative Christianity, so now may reverent scholars enrich and rekindle contemporary Christianity with the light and hope of

the East. The faith will assert new validity from the study and application of patterns set by William E. Hocking, James Bissett Pratt, Daniel J. Fleming, Floyd H. Ross, and younger scholars yet to follow both old and fresh paths. That this pilgrimage will bring hope and regeneration to Orient as well as Occident goes without saying.

Here is a call from Asia, worthy of full acceptance. In a practical sense it is a stimulus to revamp and expand the work of the minister and of the seminary. Through it the pastor adds a new realm of academic and professional proficiency which he can explore indefinitely, a wealth of thought and illustration, a fresh incentive for instructional and inspirational preaching. As for the seminaries, admit with Dean Liston Pope of Yale that in many cases their studies and methods are out of date and depressing. Their curricula can gain new color and life, and their teaching can become more dynamic and stimulating through the inclusion or extension of courses and seminars on all aspects of global religion and world affairs. Their thought forms need no longer be those originally stemming from across the Atlantic; they must grip the ideas and techniques of the populations across the Pacific. Here is an adventure which might precipitate the Christian renaissance of the atomic age. Coincidentally, our faith, able always to revitalize itself in a crisis, will reach out into the world with a relevance and charm like that which captivated the first disciples who heard the call across the waters of their familiar sea. Their Galilee with its fishing villages long ago yielded to the Mediterranean with Ephesus and Alexandria. That also proved too small to contain the faith which soon centred around the Atlantic with its Antwerp, London, both the Plymouths, Boston, and many other ports. And now the sea of the present, and of the future, has become the Pacific, which touches half the world, stretching out across the Golden Gate toward Honolulu, Yokohama, Shanghai, Manila, and all the shores which feel the restless stirrings of a new age, striving tumultuously to find itself. And that it will do, when the peaceful Christian revolution and the matured and purified forces of the Orient meet in one common flood.

Yes, religion will live and serve, cheer the weary of heart, lift the burden from the oppressed, and turn revolution to justice and peace. For us, as for millions before us, religion centres in the life of a Master who differentiated the true from the false, the permanent from the ephemeral; whose sensitivity and loyalty cost him his life, but convinced his followers that he was alive forevermore—his spirit released in a world which eventually would grasp his significance. Those who know the meaning of the cross believe implicitly in the transforming power of their faith. "What the soul is to the body," one of them wrote in the days of the early church, "that the Christians are to the world." In the present confused and revolutionary age it may again prove true, if we would have it so, that the Christians are those who hold the world together.

HUGH LATIMER AT CAMBRIDGE

ALLAN G. CHESTER

University of Pennsylvania

Two recent books have served to remind us that Cambridge University was one of the main nerve centres of the Lutheran (in contrast to the Lollard) branch of the English reformation.¹ Indeed it has been suggested that if the sixteenth century had discovered the "public relations counsel," English Protestantism might have come to be known as the Cambridge Movement. To be sure, in the nineteenth century the activities of Newman and his friends were called the Oxford Movement without benefit of such professional publicity. Oxford, however, has always had a better press than Cambridge; and the services of Cambridge to the "new learning," as the conservatives called the beginnings of the Reformation, have sometimes been forgotten. In this Cambridge movement Hugh Latimer played a major rôle.

The pioneers of the new learning at Cambridge were Thomas Bilney and George Stafford.² Bilney was ordained to priest's orders in 1519, but he dated his conversion to the new learning from the publication of Erasmus's New Testament in 1516. Bilney was something of a mystic and a good deal of an ascetic. He despised music, in church or out; when a student in adjoining rooms played upon the recorders, Bilney would resort to prayer. (Bilney was burned at the stake; the student, Thomas Thirlby, became a bishop. The point may be instructive.) George Stafford appears to have been less emotional, more intellectual than Bilney. When he was appointed lecturer in divinity, he astonished his friends and scandalized the authorities by neglecting the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard and lecturing upon the New Testament instead. Between them, Bilney and Stafford made a large number of distinguished converts to the new learning. Unfortunately, both men were cut off early. Stafford died of the plague in 1529. Bilney was burned as a heretic in 1531, the first of the Cambridge men to suffer martyrdom. Meanwhile, however, a new star had risen.

As bishop of Worcester, as court preacher, and as martyr, Latimer needs no introduction. His earlier career at Cambridge, however, is less familiar. Moreover, his biographers have overlooked the evidence of the University records for this part of his life, and they have boggled the other sources of information. Hence this paper, which at certain points

¹ E. G. Rupp, *Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition* (Cambridge, 1947), and H. Maynard Smith, *Henry VIII and the Reformation* (London, 1948).

² The best accounts of Bilney are those in the *DNB* and in Rupp, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-31. Stafford is not listed in the *DNB*, but he receives some attention in Bass Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge from the Earliest Times to the Royal Injunctions of 1535* (Cambridge, 1873), pp. 567-568, 608-609.

varies sharply from the accounts given by Demaus³ in the standard biography of Latimer and by Gairdner in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

When Latimer was elevated to the episcopate in 1535, it was said of him that he had disseminated more heresies than Luther. A certain irony therefore attaches to the fact that only a decade or so earlier he had been an ardent, indeed a vociferous defender of the old learning. A fellow of Clare Hall, he had taken priest's orders in 1515,⁴ just after proceeding master of arts. In the 1520's he occupied a position of distinction in the University. He was one of twelve University preachers, and his voice was often heard from the pulpit of St. Mary's, the University church. As University cross-keeper he was the custodian of the great silver cross and responsible for its appearance on ceremonial occasions; he was *not* merely (as his biographers have supposed) a kind of superior crucifer. He was also chaplain of the University's new chapel, in which capacity one of his functions was to say the anniversary masses for deceased benefactors of the University. He was also keeper of the public schools (the buildings in which University lectures and disputations were held) and of the small but growing University library.⁵ In all respects, he seems to have been a man of consequence in University affairs; and this view is confirmed when we find him, in 1524, conducting delicate negotiations having to do with the choice of Sir Richard Wingfield as high steward of the University.⁶

By his own account, his hatred of the heresies coming out of Germany in the early 1520's was little short of fanatical. When poor George Stafford lectured in the schools, Latimer's attacks upon him were deplorable illustrations of the fact that intense convictions are not always conjoined with good manners. In later years he declared that he had been as "obstinate a papist" as any in England. He was scrupulous to the point of morbidity in all the observances and ceremonials of his office. As for Rome, he had never for a moment doubted the pope's supreme authority, temporal as well as spiritual.⁷ If space permitted, it might be interesting to speculate how such a man, well-nigh forty years old, came to experience a radical conversion to the cause of the new learning. Some explanation might be offered in terms of social or economic determinism, and even in the depressing jargon of twentieth-century psychiatry. Such analyses, however,

³ Robert Demaus, *Hugh Latimer, a Biography* (London, 1904).

⁴ J. and J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigiensis, Part I, Vol. 3* (Cambridge, 1924), p. 49.

⁵ For the varied functions of the chaplains see H. P. Stokes, *The Chaplains and the Chapel of the University of Cambridge, 1256-1568* (Cambridge Antiquarian Soc. Pub., Octavo Series, No. XLI, Cambridge, 1906).

⁶ This is the subject of his earliest extant letter. It is printed in George E. Corrie, *Sermons and Remains of Hugh Latimer* (Parker Soc., London, 1845), pp. 295-297. (Hereafter I shall cite this work simply as *Remains*, to distinguish it from *The Sermons of Hugh Latimer* by the same editor, published under the same auspices in 1844, and cited hereafter as *Sermons*.)

⁷ *Remains*, p. 332, and *Sermons*, p. 139.

would have been as astounding to Latimer as they would prove unsatisfying to us. His own explanations would have been by way of analogy to Saul on the Damascus road or in terms of the wind which bloweth where it listeth. His would have been the truer statement.

In later years Latimer often proclaimed that the agent of his conversion was Thomas Bilney. The well-known story may be repeated briefly. When Latimer proceeded to his B.D. in 1524, his public disputation took the form of an attack upon the doctrines of Philip Melanchthon. Not long before, William Paget had been lecturing upon Melanchthon's *Rhetoric*; presumably Latimer's intention was to wing two modernists with one disputation. If the oration was in the vein of some of the later sermons, we may suspect that the performance was better theatre than theology. However that may be, Bilney was present at this memorable occasion, and he evidently saw in Latimer a man more valuable as ally than as opponent. Bilney's approach was subtle. In Latimer's rooms at Clare, Bilney asked Latimer to hear his confession. The confessor's "eyes were opened," as he himself put it. ". . . by [Bilney's] confession I learned more than before in many years. So that from that time forward I began to smell the word of God, and forsook the school-doctors and such fooleries."⁸

Although Latimer does not provide us with the exact date of this critical moment in his life, it is possible to set the time within reasonable limits. His degree in divinity is mentioned in the University *Grace Book* for the academic year between Michaelmas 1523 and Michaelmas 1524.⁹ July was the customary season for disputations in divinity and the degrees were conferred immediately thereafter. July, 1524, was therefore the probable date of Latimer's disputation; the celebrated interview between Latimer and Bilney probably belongs to the latter half of the same year.

For several years after 1524 the friendship between Bilney and Latimer was of the closest. Foxe reports their frequent walks on Castle Hill, which from this association was known for years as Heretics' Hill.¹⁰ Together they visited the sick in the lazar-cotes and the imprisoned in the "Tower" of Cambridge; in so doing they were practicing their convictions that such works of mercy were more meritorious than pilgrimages or offerings to the saints. But first they talked, with Latimer for a time as the disciple, while Bilney gradually expounded the ideas which had been developing in his own mind for upwards of a decade. It is likely that Latimer was introduced by Bilney into the group of eager young men who foregathered at the White Horse Tavern, and who were

⁸ *Sermons*, pp. 334-335.

⁹ Mary Bateson, *Grace Books B, Part II* (Cambridge, 1905), p. 114.

¹⁰ All the references to Foxe, unless otherwise noted, are to *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*, edited by Josiah Pratt (4th ed., 8 vols., London, n.d.), pp. 437-454.

facetiously called Germans because their talk savored more than a little of Lutheranism. To read their names—Arthur, Bilney, Barnes, Coverdale, Joye, Shaxton, Thixtel—is almost to call the roll of the first generation of English reformers. How Lutheran (that is, how heretical) they were at this time, it is difficult to say. Their desire for the Scriptures was certainly dangerous and impolitic, but not heretical. Certainly they wished for a reform of ecclesiastical abuse. With respect to doctrine, however, and the nature of the sacraments, probably few of them had as yet ventured very far along Luther's road.¹¹

Foxe asserts that Latimer began to preach and teach the new learning immediately after his conversion, and there is no reason to doubt the statement. We are confronted, then, with the question as to how soon Latimer found himself in trouble with the authorities. In the first edition of the *Acts and Monuments* Foxe says that two years elapsed before Latimer was cited before Wolsey; in later editions *two* was changed to *three*. This would bring us to late 1527 or early 1528, and, as I shall later attempt to show, Latimer was indeed called before Wolsey at that time.

But was he in difficulty earlier than this? All his biographers say that he was. They base their assertions on two troublesome and questionable bits of testimony. The first of these is a statement by Foxe, inserted into his later editions, to the effect that Latimer was silenced by Nicholas West, bishop of Ely, probably in the autumn of 1525, and that he evaded the inhibition by preaching in the Cambridge church of the Austin Friars, which was of course exempt from episcopal jurisdiction. Apart from the fact that it seems to have been a late gleaning, Foxe's statement is troublesome on several counts. For one thing, Foxe interpolates it into the wrong place in his narrative, as if it belonged to the year 1529. For another, there is no entry of such an inhibition in West's diocesan registers for this period. Moreover, in 1525 West (a political bishop) was not yet a hunter of heretics; as late as the summer of that year he issued to Bilney a license to preach anywhere in the diocese of Ely, although Bilney's views must have been well known to him. All things considered, Foxe's statement seems to be a bit of hearsay about an episode of which he himself had no direct knowledge.

Latimer's biographers, however, have accepted the statement without challenge; and Demaus and Gairdner, in their zeal to have Latimer in trouble early and often, have coupled it with another narrative whose validity is equally open to question. This is the well-known account, in Harleian MS. 422, of an encounter of Latimer with West, and later

¹¹ The most recent discussions of the "Germans" and the White Horse are in Rupp and Maynard Smith. See note 1.

with Wolsey.¹² This manuscript was in the possession of John Foxe, but the martyrologist made no use of it. On the basis of the handwriting, it was attributed by Strype¹³ to Ralph Morice, a Cambridge friend of Latimer and later one of Archbishop Cranmer's secretaries. At best the attribution is doubtful, and the nature of the narrative poses further questions. Briefly, the story is that on a day when Latimer was preaching *ad clerum* at St. Mary's, West and some others (presumably the diocesan official and the bishop's chaplains) entered the church abruptly after Latimer was well launched upon his sermon. Latimer paused until the episcopal party was settled. Then, saying that a new audience required a new theme, he gave out a new text—*Christus existens pontifex futurorum bonorum, etc.*—and proceeded to contrast the high calling of a bishop with the character and performance of the members of the episcopal bench as then constituted. West, an astute prelate, took the sermon in good part, and requested that Latimer at some time in the future should preach against Martin Luther. Latimer replied with equal astuteness; since it was forbidden to read Luther's books, naturally he could not refute them. So the episode ended, except, the writer adds, that thereafter West constantly sought means to put Latimer to silence.

The narrative continues with an account of Latimer's appearance, a short time later, before Wolsey. Having been complained of by West and certain members of the University, Latimer was summoned to York Place. After cooling his heels for a time in an outer room, he was ushered into the august presence of the cardinal-archbishop. Here again Latimer's behavior was astute. Under examination by Wolsey's chaplains, he showed such grasp of both the ancient and the mediæval theologians that Wolsey wondered what West and the dons had complained of. When Latimer told him of the St. Mary's sermon, Wolsey spoke disparagingly of the bishop and gave Latimer his license to preach anywhere in England. Back at Cambridge, Latimer's friends and enemies alike were dumbfounded at the turn which the affair had taken; everyone had expected him to be silenced, if not cited for heresy.

Apart from Strype's doubtful ascription of the MS. to Ralph Morice, there are three major difficulties with this story. First, it seems too good to be true. The players are out of character. Latimer, as far as is indicated by all other records of his life, was never remarkable for his suavity or his learning. Yet here he is revealed as dealing coolly and deftly with such a shrewd political churchman as Bishop West, and by his learning confusing Wolsey's chaplains, to the cardinal's delight in both instances. Second, there is difficulty with the date of the narrative, which

¹² It is printed in *Remains*, pp. xxvii-xxxi, and to this text the citations in the present article will refer.

¹³ John Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials* (Oxford, 1822), III, (1), p. 368.

the unknown writer assigns to a period shortly before the fall of Wolsey in 1529. Now, as I shall shortly attempt to show, Latimer was indeed summoned before Wolsey in 1528, but the foregoing narrative cannot refer to that occasion. By that time Wolsey was in no mood to deal genially and light-heartedly with the reformers, yet geniality and light-heartedness are the very keynotes of his manner towards Latimer as reported in this story. Finally, there is the fact that Foxe did not include the story in his account of Latimer, although the manuscript was in his possession. Certainly he would have used material so favorable to one of his heroes had he not had some reason for suspecting the reliability of his information.

The conclusion seems to me to be inescapable that none of the evidence which brings Latimer into trouble with the authorities as early as 1525 or 1526 possesses that validity which would make it admissible in a court of law. Foxe evidently knew little of these Cambridge years; and he rejected some of the testimony which came to him at second hand.

It would be unsafe, however, to say categorically that Latimer was *not* in some sort of trouble at that time, for there seems to be reason to believe that he had some share in the *cause célèbre* of Robert Barnes.¹⁴ Barnes, prior of the Austin Friars at Cambridge, had recently been converted to the cause of the new learning through the agency of George Stafford. On Christmas Eve, 1525, he preached, in St. Edward's church, a sermon which gave great offense to both the University and the local authorities. Barnes had been urged to declare his new views by Bilney, Stafford, and others including, in all likelihood, Latimer. Indeed, in the suspected passage referred to above, Foxe asserted that Latimer was preaching at the Austin Friars while the ill-advised Barnes was setting off dynamite at St. Edward's. In that statement, at least, there is nothing fundamentally improbable.

If such was indeed the fact, Latimer's sermon was discreet, Barnes' was not. Barnes not only permitted himself to make the now familiar attack upon the abuses connected with shrines and pilgrimages; he also denounced indulgences, and otherwise rushed in where his fellow "Germans" had walked delicately. Worst of all, he spoke disparagingly of the cardinal. Within a matter of hours, he was in hot water with the University authorities. His subsequent trial for heresy and his public abjuration at St. Paul's, at a ceremony over which Wolsey presided, are too familiar to need rehearsal here. Was Latimer in any similar difficulty at the same time? Apparently he was not. We have Foxe's full account of the Barnes episode, and we have Barnes' own verbose narrative written many years later. Latimer is mentioned in neither. Apparently he was

¹⁴ For Barnes, see *DNB*, Rupp, *op cit.*, pp. 31-46, and the present writer's "Robert Barnes and the Burning of the Books," *Huntington Library Quarterly*, XIV (1951), pp. 211-221.

implicated in neither the popular clamor nor the official procedures which attended the Barnes affair. Some recent writers have suggested a connection between this episode and Latimer's supposed appearance before Wolsey as recounted in Harleian MS. 422. For this there is no valid evidence.

Support for the view that Latimer was in no serious difficulty at this time is found in the fact that he continued to perform his varied university functions down to 1528. Although the Cambridge records for this ancient period are at best sketchy, Latimer's name appears in them with some frequency. It is therefore possible to indicate the nature of his activities. For example, on September 24, 1524, the very period of Latimer's first conversion, a papal nuncio was received at Cambridge with full honors. The great University cross was carried in procession, and Latimer was responsible for the management of the affair.¹⁵ There are also the records of the payment of his annual stipend of forty shillings as chaplain and keeper of the public schools for the academic years 1524-5, 1526-7, and 1527-8. In 1525-6 and 1527-8 there were audits of his accounting of certain University funds for which, as chaplain, he was responsible. In the former year one of the auditors was Dr. Edmund Natares, master of Clare Hall and vice-chancellor of the University, a reactionary of the reactionaries; in the latter year, no less a person than Thomas Cranmer served as auditor. In the academic year 1526-7, Latimer was one of a committee (Stafford, Cranmer, and Dr. Crome were also members) appointed to make a survey of University trust funds. Two years later he was a member of another committee which was likewise concerned with financial matters.¹⁶ If all of these details mean anything, they mean that he was still in the thick of University affairs, and that his new views had created no serious interruption in his academic career.

Although party lines thus seem to have been less clearly drawn than modern writers sometimes suppose, no doubt after the Barnes affair the authorities kept a more watchful eye upon the men who were spreading the Lutheran infection. The more conservative brethren of the White Horse began to separate themselves from the radicals. Stephen Gardiner ceased to be a member of the group. So did Cranmer, if indeed he had ever been of the circle. Meanwhile, Stafford, Bilney, Latimer, and the others held their peace for more than a year.

In the end Bilney was the first to break silence. In the summer of 1527 he set out on a kind of preaching mission which took him from parish to parish in the eastern counties, the suburbs of London, and finally in the city itself. A sermon preached at St. Magnus London Bridge

¹⁵ Charles H. Cooper, *Annals of Cambridge* (2 vols., Cambridge, 1842), I, p. 311.

¹⁶ *Grace Book Beta*, Part II, pp. 124, 134, 135, 142, 147. *Grace Book Gamma*, ed. William G. Searle (Cambridge, 1908), pp. 226, 237.

led to his citation for heresy before a court presided over by Cuthbert Tunstall, the bishop of London. He had been denouncing shrines and pilgrimages, the veneration of the Virgin and the saints, the sale of indulgences—all the familiar catalogue of abuses; he had also been agitating for the Scriptures, or at least the gospels, in English. In view of the measures of Tunstall and Wolsey at this precise period to suppress Tyndale's New Testament, it seems likely that Bilney's views concerning the Scriptures were not the least of his offenses. At his trial, Bilney vacillated. When he was called upon to abjure, his rhapsodic responses must have bewildered Tunstall and the other judges. Finally, upon advice of friends, he did abjure his heresies, was restored to the bosom of the church, and was imprisoned for the better part of a year. When he returned to Cambridge in 1529, Bilney was a man of broken and contrite heart. He rebuked himself for another Iscariot. The consolatory efforts of Latimer, his closest friend, availed nothing.¹⁷

Meanwhile, what of Latimer? In what follows I hope to show that he shared with Bilney the risk of forthright declarations concerning the Bible in English. Whether the two men proceeded by prearrangement, or whether Latimer took up the torch as it fell from Bilney's failing hand, I do not know. The time sequence suggests the latter explanation.

None of Latimer's biographers has noticed that the Cambridge *Grace Books* record the fact that he preached *ad clerum* in St. Mary's, Cambridge, on the sixteenth and seventeenth Sundays after Trinity, 1528.¹⁸ I suggest that these were part of a series of sermons, some of which were delivered in English to the people of Cambridge, in which Latimer openly demanded that the Scriptures in English ought to be allowed. The biographers seem to have missed the fact of the existence of these sermons, as distinct from the "sermons on the card," which were not preached until at least eighteen months afterwards. The confusion is due to Foxe, who mentions the sermons, but in such a way as to confuse them with the sermons on the card.

Yet the evidence for the earlier sermons is quite clear. William Turner, in his preface to *A Preservative or triacle agaynst the poyson of Pelagius* (1551) refers distinctly to Latimer's Cambridge sermons on the English Bible.¹⁹ Even more precise is the testimony of Thomas Becon's *Jewel of Joy*.²⁰ The sermons were preached, says Becon, in both Latin and English. In them Latimer proved "that the holy scriptures

¹⁷ *Remains*, pp. 51-52.

¹⁸ *Grace Book B, Part II*, p. 140.

¹⁹ William Turner, *A preservative, or triacle, agaynst the poyson of Pelagius* (1551), Preface to "Mr. Hugh Latimer." For this reference, and for many kindly suggestions, I am indebted to Mr. J. F. Mozley, whose books on Tyndale and Foxe are well known to students of this period.

²⁰ Thomas Becon, *The Jewel of Joy*. In *The Catechism of Thomas Becon . . . with Other Pieces Written by Him in the Reign of King Edward the Sixth* (Cambridge, Parker Society, 1844), pp. 424-425.

ought to be read in the English tongues of all Christian people, whether they were priests or laymen . . . which thing divers drowsy duncers, with certain false flying flattering friars, could not abide, but openly in their unsavory sermons resisted his goodly purpose. . . ." Immediately after this passage Becon writes that he was *also* present when Latimer preached against "temple-works, good intents, blind zeal, superstitious devotion"—a concise description of the sermons on the card. Clearly Becon is distinguishing between two sets of sermons. He also provides us with a fairly precise date. The sermons on the Bible were preached, he says, when he was a poor scholar at Cambridge and only sixteen years old. Now Becon, born in 1512, would have been sixteen in the summer of 1528.

No student of this period will need to be reminded that Latimer, like Bilney before him, had chosen a singularly dangerous time to speak out strongly on behalf of the English Bible. Wolsey, after a period of slackness, was bearing down on the Lutherans in genuine earnest, with the result that for the English reformers the years 1527 and 1528 were marked by terror and alarm. We have glanced at Bilney's troubles. For the record may be added a reminder of Wolsey's severities at Oxford, where his newly established Cardinal's College had been discovered to be a hotbed of heresy imported from Cambridge; and of the activities of Tunstall, spurred on by Wolsey, in bringing to account some fifty alleged heretics from among the humble folk of the diocese of London.

Latimer's sermons provoked an immediate outcry, and not only from the Scotists and the friars within the University. At a synod of the diocese of Ely, held on June 9, 1528, in the church of the Austin Canons at Barnwell, a mile outside of Cambridge, Bishop West thundered against the *biblia secundum novam interpretationem* and forbade its use by the clergy of the diocese.²¹ I have no doubt that he singled out Latimer for special attention, and I am inclined to assign to this convocation Foxe's statement that West preached against Latimer at Barnwell and forbade him to preach in the University churches, a statement about which, as we have seen, Foxe seems to have been thoroughly confused.

If my reconstruction of these events is correct, probably one of the first consequences would have been for Latimer to be deprived of his various University functions. Such may be the interpretation to be placed upon the fact that after 1528 the duties of cross-keeper and chaplain were taken over by Nicholas Heath.²² (In this succession there rests a certain irony, for in 1543 Heath was appointed bishop of Worcester, after Latimer had been deprived of that office.) I would not, however, push too strongly the suggestion that Latimer was removed from these posts, for the

²¹ David Wilkins, *Concilii Magnæ Britanniae et Hiberniae* (4 vols., London, 1737), III, p. 713.

²² See Stokes, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

precise date of Heath's succession is not clear. Shortly after these events Latimer moved into a larger arena, and it may be that he resigned them voluntarily.

Was it in connection with these sermons that Latimer was summoned before the cardinal about three years after his conversion, as asserted by Foxe? Almost certainly it was. Probably West complained of Latimer to Wolsey, who was in no mood to ignore such flagrant utterances as Latimer's. Confirmation is to be found in the Cambridge *Grace Books*, which record that, sometime between Easter and Michaelmas, 1528, a servant of the cardinal arrived at Cambridge armed with a summons bearing the king's seal, for "Master Latimer and others."²³ It is possible that one of the cardinal's agents or messengers was Ralph Moryson, who in 1533 wrote that five years earlier he had gone from the cardinal's house to Cambridge to look into Latimer's case.²⁴

Who were the others? For clues to an answer we turn to Strype, who in his *Memorials*²⁵ summarizes the content of a MS. once in the possession of Foxe but apparently not now extant. According to Strype, this document had to do with certain Cambridge men who had been busy about the distribution of English New Testaments. Rodolf Bradford, fellow of King's Hall, had gone up to London, met one Geoffrey Lome, and the two of them had gone to Reading to distribute testaments. A monk who had been involved in the transaction was detected and arrested, whereupon he implicated Bradford and the others. Letters were then sent to the vice-chancellor of the University to arrest Bradford, Dr. Richard Smith of Trinity Hall, Simon Smith of Caius, Sygar Nicholson (sometime of Gonville Hall, and latterly a Cambridge stationer who on several occasions was in trouble over his possession of Lutheran books), and *Hugh Latimer*. The narrative closes with the statement that Bradford fled to Ireland, where he was arrested and imprisoned; after two years he returned to London.

Several points in this episode tend to fix its date as 1528. Richard Smith of Trinity did not become a doctor until 1528 and he died in 1529. Bradford lost his fellowship at King's in 1528, an inevitable consequence of his flight to Ireland. From other sources we know that both Lome and Sygar Nicholson were cited for heresy in 1528 and that both abjured. About this time also Simon Smith fled to Antwerp, where he remained until 1530 or 1531.²⁶

²³ *Grace Book Beta, Part II*, p. 145.

²⁴ Foxe, VII, p. 773 (Appendix V).

²⁵ Strype, *op. cit.*, I, (1), p. 487. The significance of this narrative was perceived by the compiler of the notes to Foxe (VII, p. 773) but he did not press the matter to its conclusion.

²⁶ Cooper, *Athenæ Cantabrigienses*, I, and Venn, *op. cit.*, s.v. Bradford, Nicholson, Richard Smith, Simon Smith. A number of these points were suggested to me by Mr. Mozley.

Here, as I believe, are the names of the "others" who were summoned before Wolsey by the authority of the document cited in the *Grace Book*. Lome, of course, was not of the University. Bradford and Simon Smith fled. The fate of Richard Smith is not known; perhaps he got off by reason of illness, since he died shortly thereafter. Nicholson was compelled to abjure. Latimer, the most distinguished of the group, was called up before the cardinal.

It is with the summer or autumn of 1528, then, and with the consequences of certain sermons on the English Bible, that I would associate Foxe's statement, alluded to earlier, that "after master Latimer had thus travailed in preaching and teaching in the university of Cambridge about the space of three [*two* in the first edition] years, at length he was called up to the cardinal for heresy, by the procurement of certain of the said university, where he was content to subscribe and grant to such articles as then they propounded unto him."²⁷ Demaus, as I believe quite incorrectly, identifies this appearance before the cardinal with the story in Harleian MS. 422. I have already tried to show that the temper of Wolsey in that episode, if it ever occurred, is quite inappropriate to his known disposition toward heretics in 1528. I should like to believe that in 1528 the cardinal was so impressed with Latimer's abilities that he issued to the great preacher a license to preach anywhere in England. But in biography, no less than in fiction, the probabilities must be observed.

Nonetheless, it is clear that Latimer got off lightly. Barnes and Bilney had been forced to make public abjurations; subsequently both had been imprisoned for a year or more. There is no evidence that Latimer suffered any such ignominy, or even that he formally renounced his alleged heresy. Foxe is vague about the matter, and there is no other testimony. As Demaus points out, when Latimer was cited for heresy before the bishop of London in 1531-2 (an episode which lies beyond the scope of this paper), he was not treated as a relapsed heretic. Probably in 1528 he proved tractable, no judicial proceedings were instituted against him, and he was let off with an admonition. It is possible also that he had an easy passage because he had not ventured in his sermons to launch a direct attack upon Wolsey's magnificence or malfeasance. Both Barnes and Bilney had rashly done so; and it is impossible to escape the conclusion that therein lay the reason for the severity with which they had been treated.

By the end of the year 1528, then, the White Horse group had been pretty well dispersed. Stafford no doubt continued to exercise a quiet influence on behalf of the new learning. As for the others, Frith had repaired to Oxford and had been imprisoned; Barnes and Bilney had

²⁷ Foxe, VII, p. 454.

abjured and were imprisoned; Joye, Coverdale, Bradford, and others had fled. Crome, Shaxton, and Cranmer had not yet spoken out. Of the vocal ones, only Latimer remained, and for the time being, we may be sure, he was content to walk softly.

Latimer's next recorded utterances are the "sermons on the card," which belong to the Christmas season, 1529. Before those famous homilies were preached, however, a new factor had been injected into the complicated equation. Henry VIII, as some irreverent wag has put it, had seen the gospel light in the eyes of Anne Boleyn. Other measures of ridding himself of his aging queen having failed, Henry was willing to temporize with the new learning. Sometime in 1529, probably in July, Cranmer made his famous suggestion that the universities of Europe be consulted in the matter of the divorce. When the question was submitted to Oxford and Cambridge, the reformers were given generous representation on the committees which were relied upon to bring in a verdict favorable to the king. Before Christmas, 1529, it had been determined that Latimer would be a key member of the Cambridge committee.

From this position of eminence and comparative safety Latimer dared to preach the sermons on the card, the outlines of which have been preserved by Foxe. No need to concern ourselves here with the questionable taste of Latimer's use of playing cards in the pulpit and the answering use of dice by one of his opponents. Nor need we repeat the familiar substance of the sermons. The criticism of pilgrimages and offerings to the saints seems mild enough today; indeed they are not much more severe, although they are far less urbane, than similar comments by Erasmus or Thomas More. The conservatives, however, were outraged by both form and matter. Small wonder that the heads of colleges, almost to a man, attacked Latimer, or that Bishop West and Prior Buckenham of the Blackfriars both preached against him.

His enemies denounced him in vain. The fellows of St. John's seem to have been the leaders of the attack, which was couched in terms of unedifying abuse. At this game, however, both sides could play, and the provost of King's complained that Latimer was more vehement than "becomes the very evangelist of Christ." The vice-chancellor, Dr. Buckmaster, appointed a day to investigate the charges and countercharges, but the opposition, when put to the test, proved evanescent or frivolous.²⁸ The shadow of Windsor lay darkly over Cambridge.

Although Latimer retained his fellowship at Clare for a year after the sermons on the card, his activities took him with increasing frequency into the larger world of affairs. His last important function at Cam-

²⁸ *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, IV, Nos. 6162 and 6176. The documents are also in Demaus and Cooper, *Annals*, I, pp. 435 ff.

bridge was to serve upon the commission chosen to determine the opinion of the university in the matter of the king's divorce. Indeed, Cranmer and Latimer seem to have been largely instrumental in securing a vote favorable to the king's cause, in the face of some stubborn opposition. Ironically, he was also a member of a commission which in May, 1530, promulgated a list of heretical and hence forbidden books, including the writings of Tyndale. He preached with increasing frequency at court, and some have supposed, without evidence, that he became one of the court chaplains. In January, 1531, he was appointed rector of West Kington in Wiltshire, a living which was in the gift of the crown. The Cambridge period had ended.

If the Cambridge chronology is as I have described it, we shall have to make some corrections in our notions of the character of Hugh Latimer. Instead of the impulsive, headstrong man, plunging heedlessly down the road to reform, he emerges as a man essentially deliberate, even cautious, waiting for the turn of events. In such terms his later career takes on new meaning, particularly his recantation of heresy in 1532 and his less than impetuous attitude towards the Act of the Six Articles. And in his martyrdom he acquires new stature, for the sufferings of the reflective man are likely to be greater than those of the hot-head.

All this search for the fact may seem a tremendous pother, a stirring of dead bones. In some respects it is. But the Cambridge years were of fundamental significance as the formative period of Latimer's career and of the cause for which he was no mean spokesman. As one who has not yet succumbed to the fashionable habit of depreciating the reformers I should like to know more of those Cambridge years. There began the road which was to lead to the episcopal palace at Worcester, to the pulpit at Westminster, and at last to the holocaust at Oxford. "Cambridge had the honor of educating those celebrated Protestant bishops whom Oxford had the honor of burning," said Macaulay. The remark is unfair to the older University, but then Macaulay, like other journalists of more recent and less palatable vintage, was ever fonder of phrase than of fact. In some measure Oxford has made amends, for in the Cornmarket stands the Martyrs' Memorial, a tribute to Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, sons of Cambridge all three. Cambridge has no such memorial. Perhaps it is better so. We may paraphrase Shakespeare's comment upon his own poetry; not marble nor gilded monuments will outlive the powerful words uttered by Latimer as he went to the flames: "Be of good comfort, Master Ridley, and play the man. We shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as I trust shall never be put out."

A CASE STUDY IN CHURCH MERGERS

CHARLES E. SCHAEFFER

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

EVEN a casual observer of religious trends in American Protestantism is definitely aware of the shifting emphasis in the program of the church. Prior to the twentieth century the main concern of the church lay in the field of theology. The maintenance of sound doctrine and biblical orthodoxy was the paramount issue. Then, under the impact of a secular philosophy, known as pragmatism, and the claims of a theory of development, known as progress, there came about a change of emphasis in practical Christianity. Religious or Christian education, followed by a revival of the social implications and application of the gospel, began to be stressed, until the church was conceived of largely as an ethical cultural society, and the religious life was interpreted in terms of behaviorism and creature comforts. This emphasis upon the practical and the ethical brought about a changed attitude by the respective churches to one another; and they began to think of their similarities, rather than of their differences. A common objective drew them into a common fellowship. Moreover, as the younger churches in foreign mission fields set the example as to the possibilities of united effort in the accomplishment of their tasks, the churches at home began to plan along similar lines. Interdenominational councils were formed, such as the Federal Council, State Councils of Churches, the Home Missions Council, the Foreign Missions Conference, the International Council of Religious Education, the Conference of Faith and Order, the Conference of Life and Work, which two evolved into the World Council of Churches. Thus, on the national and international levels there were projected a number of agencies and activities, which began to change the ecclesiastical climate until the whole thing crystallized into what is known as the Ecumenical Movement. The history of this phenomenon has been duly presented in other writings. It remains, however, that we should make a case study rather than offer a general survey. We want to discover what has already been accomplished in this field, and what the outcome has been.

Since 1906 organic union has been achieved in at least fifteen specific instances affecting thirty-two separate bodies. While this seems to be a negligible number among several hundred denominations which still go their several ways, it indicates a trend which characterizes the contemporary scene.

But before we make our study and appraisal it behooves us to inquire somewhat into the reasons which brought about differences and divisions at the first. A study of denominationalism, the rise and progress of reli-

gious bodies, is often very complicated because so many factors enter into a given situation; but in the by-and-large, the points at which denominational ruptures occur are three in number. They are doctrine, polity or government, and piety, which includes worship and practical living. Churches generally split on doctrinal grounds, or on forms of government, or on the interpretation of the religious life. Sometimes personal or individual idiosyncracies play a part, but usually the issues involved seem very vital, at least for the time being.

Now, a study of the denominational mergers thus far completed, reveals that, with but few exceptions, the union has been a *reunion*, that is, a return to the parent or original body. In the majority of cases the mergers have been within the same family of churches. There are only a few that do not fall within this category. Consequently, the unions thus far, in the main, have followed the course of least resistance. Issues which once separated them, in course of time ceased to press with the same force; a new generation of leaders had arisen, and traditional emphases were no longer regarded as sacrosanct. Thus the way to union, or reunion, became less difficult. Moreover, the prevailing atmosphere in Christianity itself, the awareness of the scandal of a divided Protestantism, and the apparent waste of men and money—all seemed to conspire to bring some of these atomistic families into a common body. Our study further will reveal that the reasons for union were confined almost wholly to the temporal or the human situation. The argument for it was based largely on expediency. It was expedient to get together. Indeed, this prudential, or utilitarian, motive underlies much of the present-day propaganda for church union in general. We must unite if we wish to combat the organized forces of evil in the world; but this is a very superficial, if not fallacious, reason why the churches should get together. It is another temptation for the church to accept the ways of the world in the accomplishment of its purpose in the world.

The real reason for church union lies not in the outward situation, but rather in the conviction that unity is the only true expression of the meaning and nature of the church itself.

With these general observations in mind, let us look at the cases in particular. The first merger was that of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church with the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. which occurred in 1906. The Cumberland Presbyterian Church was originally a secession movement from the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. In the opening years of the nineteenth century a remarkable religious revival arose in the United States, which, in Kentucky and elsewhere, was accompanied by strange "bodily exercises." As the movement spread, more ministers were required and the presbytery of Cumberland, to meet the emergency, inducted into

the ministry men who lacked the necessary academic and theological training. To this procedure the synod of Kentucky strenuously objected, which objection was confirmed by the General Assembly. Whereupon the leaders in the revival movement withdrew from the church and formed an independent body, patterned, however, along the lines of the parent body.

The new church grew rapidly, but since its strength lay largely in the border States the question of the Negro churches became a very decided issue. The upshot was that another denomination, known as the Colored Cumberland Presbyterian Church, was formed which is still in existence.

The main stream of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church continued for practically one hundred years. But in the meantime it sought union with other churches—among them the Presbyterian Church U.S.—the Presbyterian Church U.S.A.; the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and the Methodist Protestant Church. In the meantime, the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. had revised its confession of faith to the satisfaction of the Cumberland group, and the question of union rose again with the result that in 1903 both general assemblies appointed committees on fraternity and union. The following year the basis of union which the joint committee had formulated was adopted. However, there was a strong protest in the Cumberland body who appealed the matter to the civil court which declared the action on merger to be legal. Several other appeals were taken to higher courts. These were refused in each instance, and in 1906 the denomination officially identified itself with the Presbyterian Church U.S.A., while a small group persisted to continue the organization as a separate body.

The next union is that of the Northern Baptist Convention and the Free Baptist Churches. This occurred in 1911.

The Free Baptist Churches in this country trace their origin back to 1780 when Benjamin Randall organized a church at New Durham, New Hampshire. Randall was converted by Whitefield's death, rather than by his preaching. He began preaching at the age of twenty-seven, but his views were regarded as heretical by his fellow ministers who leaned toward the Calvinistic faith, and he was disfellowshipped; whereupon he proceeded to organize a church at New Durham. After two years of labor he had won only seven members into his church. Soon, however, several other ministers allied themselves with him and the work began to grow. They differed from the regular Baptists by preferring the early Greek to the Augustinian, or the Arminian to the Calvinistic theology, and by recognizing pedobaptists as Christian churches. While they regarded the five points of Calvinism as a misfit in the general scheme of Christianity, they enjoyed the oneness of all who love the Lord. This attitude won her many suitors for marriage, but she would listen to none save that of the regular

Baptists. In 1905 the idea of union was launched. The terms proposed were so Christian that three quarters of the members of the Free Baptist Churches voted in favor, and the union was happily and fully consummated in 1911.

The third merger which occurred in 1917 is a union of three Lutheran bodies: 1. Hague's Norwegian Evangelical Lutheran Synod; 2. Synod of the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America; 3. United Norwegian Lutheran Church in America—to constitute the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America. In the *Religious Census* of the United States there are listed twenty-two separate bodies under the general title of Lutherans.

The Lutheran branch of the Reformation developed principally in Germany and in the Scandinavian countries, especially Norway and Sweden. Upon coming to America, the Lutheran immigrants settled in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Maryland, Virginia, and North and South Carolina. A later stream flowed out into the Middle West; but in every instance the pastors and congregations organized themselves into so-called "synods," each of which had a sort of independent status. In 1820 the existing synods in the East formed a general synod, which was a federated body, for the purpose of achieving greater coöperation.

The Norwegians in the Middle West, however, were not quite so fortunate. They were individualists and nationalistic, and, instead of uniting, they separated themselves into smaller cells. Thus, in time there developed five or six rival synods among them.

One of them was the Hague Synod, so named by the followers of Hans Nielsen Hague, a prominent layman who was the leading spirit in a great religious awakening in Norway at the turn of the eighteenth century. This synod was formed in 1846. In 1853 another group of ministers from Norway organized the Synod of the Norwegian Evangelical Lutheran Church of America. Then in 1860 there was formed by another group the Norwegian Augustana Synod, and the same year the Norwegian-Danish Conference. In 1877 the Anti-Missouri Brotherhood came into being. This group in 1877 invited the various Norwegian Lutheran synods to merge. After prolonged negotiations, in 1890, three groups—the Norwegian Augustana, the Norwegian-Danish, and the Norwegian Anti-Missouri Brotherhood—united to form the United Norwegian Lutheran Church in America.

This now reduced the number of synods to three. Then in 1905 the Hague Synod took up the question of union of these three bodies. A plan of union was formulated which was adopted by each body, and the groups met at St. Paul, Minnesota, on June 9, 1917, where the union was finally consummated on the four hundredth anniversary of the Protestant Reformation, bringing together the three synods, under the name of the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, with a membership of half a million souls.

The fourth merger took place in 1918, and this time again among three Lutheran bodies. The scene, however, shifts to the East and South. The three Lutheran bodies were known as the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, U.S.A., the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America, and the United Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the South. Each of these organizations has a very interesting history. We can merely touch the fringes of the same.

As previously stated, the general synod which was formed in 1820 under the leadership of Dr. S. S. Schmucker, the president of the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, at the time embraced all the Lutheran synods in the East. Then during the Civil War the Southern synods withdrew from the General Synod and organized a new body known as the United Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the South. Then a second breach occurred in 1866. This centred largely around doctrinal and liturgical issues. A number of synods, led by the ministerium of Pennsylvania, taking exception to the alleged doctrinal indifference and laxity on the part of the General Synod, withdrew, and organized a new body known as the General Council. This now erected its own institutions, such as Muhlenberg College, the Theological Seminary at Mount Airy, and numerous benevolent and missionary operations. Inasmuch as the General Synod and the General Council occupied the same territory and claimed the same mission fields, there was much rivalry and conflict between them. However, the spirit making for unity was never wholly obscured. In all of Lutheranism there is a remarkable unity of faith which eventually must come to expression in outward organization and coöperative effort.

From 1877 to 1902 numerous conferences were held intended to bring about mutual understanding and good will. A common service book was prepared and put into general use. Likewise in 1917 a common hymnal was adopted, and extensive arrangements were made, beginning as early as 1914, for a joint celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of the Reformation in 1917. These were the preliminary steps which led to the unification of these three Lutheran bodies in America. Definite plans were formulated, a constitution was drawn up, which was duly ratified by each body, and the first convention of the United Lutheran Church of America was held in New York, Nov. 14-18, 1918. The United Church has a membership of almost 2,000,000 and, under a highly organized system, is one of the great religious forces in America and throughout the world.

We now take up the fifth of these mergers. This was effected in 1920 between the Presbyterian U.S.A. and the Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Church. This is more of an absorption than of a union.

The Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Church traces its origin to Wales where it was the mother church. During the seventeenth and eighteenth

centuries Welsh immigrants came to the American Colonies in large numbers, and as early as 1690 a Welsh Presbyterian congregation was gathered in the Great Valley, Chester County, Pennsylvania, and was ministered unto by the Reverend David Evan, the first licentiate educated by the Presbyterian Church in America. Later, congregations were formed in New York, in Ohio, in Wisconsin, and in other parts of Pennsylvania. The doctrines of this church were in substantial agreement with the doctrines of the Westminster Confession. The word "Methodist" in the name did not define a form of doctrine or polity, but rather methods of Christian life and work. It used no liturgy and conducted its services mainly in the Welsh language. Dr. William H. Roberts, formerly stated clerk of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, came out of this fellowship and for a long period served as editor of their monthly denominational magazine, *The Friend from the Old Country*.

The younger generation in time identified themselves with the Presbyterian Church, so that only a remnant was left, who naturally and eventually united as a body with the Presbyterian Church. Its communicant members never exceeded fifteen thousand who were served by less than one hundred ministers.

The sixth merger in the historical sequence occurred in 1922, between the Evangelical Association and the United Evangelical Church, under the name of the Evangelical Church. Here we have, in the first place, a rupture, and then a subsequent reunion.

Both of these bodies trace their history back to one Jacob Albright, the son of a German immigrant in Eastern Pennsylvania, who was confirmed in the Lutheran Church, and later experienced a change of heart through a funeral sermon by a minister of the Reformed Church, and then joined with the Methodists who set him apart as a minister of the gospel and ordained him as an elder. He began to preach in private houses, barns, schoolhouses, and in the open air, and soon won a following among the Pennsylvania German people who called themselves "The Albright Brethren." Albright College in Reading is named after him. The movement which he inaugurated was patterned largely after the Methodist Episcopal order, including the circuit and itinerant system. Also the office of bishop and other activities were after the Methodist model. In 1816 the name was changed to The Evangelical Association. As such it made phenomenal progress because it represented a highly emotionalized type of religious life and made proselytes from members of other churches who were in search of deeper piety and devotion. In 1854 the church started an important work in Germany and Switzerland which is still conducted under the supervision of a bishop for that area. It carried forward an extensive missionary program, projecting its work into Japan, China, Russia, and Africa. As early as 1815 it established a church publishing house and

was carrying forward an educational work in no less than five institutions of higher grade.

Then in 1891 a division occurred which resulted in the organization of a secession body known as the United Evangelical Church. The difficulties were not doctrinal in character, but pertained rather to official acts on the part of bishops and legislative bodies. The fellowship was now rent in twain—a “majority” and a “minority” group, with conferences and congregations. Rival churches in many communities were organized, and the atmosphere was heavily charged with dissension. Then after this disruption had spent itself, there came a change of heart. As early as 1907 the General Conference of the Evangelical Association made the first overture toward reunion. In 1910 the United Evangelical Church took definite steps toward such a reunion. In 1918 a partial basis of union was framed, which was completed in 1921. Then late in October, 1922, the two churches were united under the name of the Evangelical Church.

It should be stated, however, that two conferences belonging to the United Evangelical Church refused to go into the union and continued a separate existence under the name of the Evangelical Congregational Church, whose membership is small and who, in course of time, may seek admission in the united body.

The seventh merger is likewise an absorption of a smaller by a larger body. It is that of the Hungarian Reformed Church in America with the Reformed Church in the United States, which occurred in 1922. Here is an instance of a European church operating on American soil, uniting with a denomination whose historic roots go back to the Reformation, and whose American history starts with the year 1725.

The Protestant church in Hungary is prevailingly of the Reformed or Calvinistic faith. In the last two decades of the nineteenth century Hungarian immigration to America was very large. They settled in industrial centres like Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Johnstown, Buffalo, and Chicago. As early as 1891 the Reformed Church in the United States established congregations among this nationality in Cleveland and Pittsburgh. The Presbyterian Church in 1900 began missionary work among them at Throop, Pennsylvania. By 1905 the Reformed Church had established eighteen Hungarian congregations. Then in that year the authorities in Hungary sent a representative to America to organize a national Hungarian church under the control and support of the church in Hungary. The upshot was that a number of already existing churches of the Reformed and Presbyterian denominations affiliated themselves with this foreign body, with the result that the Hungarian National Church soon outnumbered those still belonging to both the Reformed and Presbyterian Churches. Then the first world war came. Since the authorities in Hungary were unable to furnish the subsidy needed to maintain their work here,

they made overtures for union with some American church. They first applied to the Dutch Reformed Church, then to the Presbyterian Church, and both these bodies referred them to the Reformed Church in the United States. This was the logical thing to do, since the Reformed Church had started the work among these people, and was still caring for the larger number of congregations. An agreement known as the Tiffin Agreement was drawn up which provided that these national churches, which had meanwhile formed themselves into two classes, or districts, should come into the fellowship of the Reformed Church on an equal basis with other classes belonging to it. A small contingency, however, declined to come into the union and in 1924 at Duquesne, Pennsylvania, organized themselves into the Free Magyar Reformed Church in America. Those, however, who came into the larger fellowship, were duly assimilated and seem well satisfied in their new relationship.

The eighth merger was that of the Congregational churches and the Evangelical Protestant Church, which took place in 1925. This again partakes of the nature of an absorption. The Congregational churches, according to their inherent order, are unable to unite with any other body which involves a change of their fundamental principle of government, but they are not prevented from absorbing any group that may be willing to come into their fellowship. The Evangelical Protestant Church has an interesting history. In the first three decades of the nineteenth century large numbers of German and German Swiss came to America. They originally belonged to the Lutheran and the Swiss Reformed Churches. Their first church was the Smithfield Church in Pittsburgh. From 1800 to 1850 there sprang up a large number of congregations from Pittsburgh to St. Louis. Eventually these churches formed a general association under the leadership of Dr. Carl A. Voss. In 1923 at the National Council of the Congregational Churches a delegation from the Evangelical Protestant Church was present, and two years later, in 1925, negotiations were consummated whereby this body was received as a *conference* on a parity with State conferences. At the time it consisted of twenty-three congregations. Since then some of them have affiliated with the State conference in which they are located.

The ninth merger takes us across the border to Canada, when, in 1925, the Congregational Churches of Canada, the Methodist Church, and the Presbyterian Church in Canada formed an organic union under a new name: "The United Church of Canada." This is a union of such magnitude that a brief statement pertaining to it must be regarded as wholly inadequate. There is always a historical background to any great movement. Forces and factors in the church, in the state, and in the whole social order, become operative, which create a general atmosphere, a favorable condition, which gives birth to a new creation. The whole history

of the political and religious life of Canada is a story of bringing separate units into an organic whole. Politically, national unity came to expression in confederation. Religiously, or ecclesiastically, for over a century or more, there were a score of unions of the separate branches of the parent churches. The Presbyterian Churches was itself the product of nine unions and seven absorptions of formerly independent bodies. The Methodist church had gathered into itself sixteen separate bodies in eight successive unions, while the two streams of Congregationalism from England and New England, had, a score of years before the union, brought together their separate bodies into the Congregational Union of Canada. There was then only one Methodist general conference, one Presbyterian general assembly, and one Congregational council of Canada, when the matter of organic union loomed upon the horizon. This greatly facilitated the whole scheme and contributed to the success of the enterprise.

It was, however, by no means a spasmodic movement. As far back as 1902 the General Conference of the Methodist Church proposed a measure for organic union for all evangelical churches of Canada. To this invitation the Presbyterian and Congregational churches responded favorably. A joint committee of the three churches was appointed and wrought out a basis of union, after laboring on it for five years. This was approved by the supreme governing bodies of the three denominations, as well as by the individual members of the congregations. It was originally proposed to consummate the union in 1916, but war conditions at the time made the delay advisable. In the meantime also a minority group in the Presbyterian Church began to assert itself, and it was felt that time would heal the difference. So the matter dragged on until July 19, 1924, when the Act of Incorporation of the United Church of Canada was approved, and the new body began to function.

The *Basis of Union* is a very comprehensive document. It includes such general items as doctrine, which is broken down into twenty specific articles; polity, which pertains to the ecclesiastical structure, its governing bodies and church courts, on both the national and local levels; the ministry, training and functions; administration, of its missionary, educational, benevolent, and other connectional enterprises. The two great principles which motivated the structural and functional phases of the union are expressed by the words: *liberty* and *efficient coöperation*.

Of the amazing results of this merger during this quarter of a century, it is impossible to speak so as to give an adequate account of it; but in all departments of its work it has demonstrated that the union has been blessed of God and has achieved almost unbelievable results both at home and abroad.

The minority group in the Presbyterian fellowship has persisted in its efforts to maintain a continuing Presbyterian Church in Canada. With

the odds strongly against it, it has nevertheless gathered considerable momentum, and is by no means a negligible body. The years will tell whether or not this organization will eventually come into the larger fellowship and thus greatly strengthen the union itself.

The tenth merger is that of the Congregational churches and the Christian (General Convention) to form the Congregational-Christian Churches. This took place in 1931.

The Christian denomination in America was originally formed out of three schismatic movements: one group which withdrew from the Methodist Episcopal Church as far back as 1792; another, which broke with the Baptists because of Calvinistic doctrines which had infiltrated into the Baptist fellowship about 1803; the third, a secession group in Kentucky which left the Presbyterian Church during the religious revival in that part of the country in 1804.

These three elements eventually came together and formed the Christian Church. In 1832, the Disciples of Christ and the Christians in Kentucky united. Consequently through parts of the West the Disciples call themselves "Christian." But the rest of the Christian fellowship in other parts of the country continued under their original name and organization. They adhered to the Bible only and renounced all doctrinal statement—even the term *trinity* was under ban; because of which they were sometimes linked up with the Unitarians. They established numerous academies, like Elon College in North Carolina, and planted their first college, Antioch, at Yellow Springs, Ohio, under the presidency of Horace Mann. A Christian Biblical Institute—for the sole purpose of studying the Bible—was founded at Defiance, Ohio. Its president was Austin Craig, a man of remarkable scholarship. Christians and Unitarians coöperated in founding Meadville Theological Seminary. They were the first in modern times to ordain a woman to the Christian ministry.

Negotiations for merger with the Congregationalists began as far back as 1880. Nothing came of it. Then it was renewed in 1895, and again it was scrapped; but in 1923 the matter was taken up *de novo*. In the negotiations the Congregationalists expressed a willingness to give up the name Congregational, but finally it was agreed to retain both names in the title. The actual merger took place at Seattle, Washington. Following the union of the two national bodies, the various boards and agencies likewise were consolidated, and local churches in given communities have also merged as Congregationalist-Christian churches. On the whole, the arrangement has been quite satisfactory.

The eleventh merger, which occurred in 1930, is that of three Lutheran bodies, known as the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Ohio and other States, the Lutheran Synod of Buffalo, and the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Iowa and other States, to form "The American Lutheran

Church." This body maintains headquarters in Chicago and in Columbus, Ohio, where it has a large book concern. It operates in thirty-two States, in the District of Columbia, and in five Canadian provinces. It supports two theological seminaries, two colleges, and three junior colleges, also six homes for orphans, five for aged persons, and three hospitals. Its foreign mission work is in India and in New Guinea.

The twelfth merger, in 1934, was between the Reformed Church in the United States and the Evangelical Synod of North America. This was definitely an organic union of two distinct denominations, and not merely an absorption or reunion.

The Reformed Church traces its origin back to the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and represents the Zwinglian and Calvinistic emphasis as over against the Lutheran and Melancthonian types of the Lutheran branch. It took its rootage in America as early as 1725 and was known as the German Reformed Church. For a full generation it was under the fostering care of the church in Holland, but declared its independence in 1793. Together with the Lutherans it founded Franklin College at Lancaster, and in 1825 established its first theological seminary at Carlisle, which, after a brief sojourn at York, in 1836 moved to Mercersburg, where also Marshall College was located the same year. At Mercersburg, under the leadership of Dr. John W. Nevin and Philip Schaff, a distinct type of theology was developed known as the "Mercersburg theology." During its long history it made numerous overtures for union with other bodies, notably the Lutherans, the Dutch Reformed, and the Presbyterian Church. All of these efforts proved abortive.

The Evangelical Synod of North America was itself a union product. It was composed of German immigrants who came to America by way of the Gulf of Mexico and up the Mississippi River, and settled in and around St. Louis where the first church was founded in 1840. They called themselves the Evangelical Union of the West, and represented largely the evangelical union which had developed in Germany in 1817 when certain parts of Lutheranism and Reformed were united into a union church. Similar groups of these immigrants settled in Ohio, in Western New York, in Illinois, Wisconsin, and elsewhere in the Middle West. These groups gathered their religious life into so called *synods* much after the Lutheran type. Then in the 60's they brought these various groups together under the name of the Evangelical Synod of North America.

There were many points of interest between the churches of this body and the Reformed Church in the United States—although there were also differences. In 1929 a movement was afoot to unite three denominations which had more or less the same national and historical background. These were the Reformed Church in the United States, the Evangelical Synod of North America, and the United Brethren in Christ. At an early stage

of the movement the United Brethren withdrew from the arrangement. This left the other two bodies to continue negotiations. A new plan of union was formulated and in 1932 was adopted by the supreme judicatories of each body. The lower courts likewise gave approval and the union was consummated at Cleveland, June 26, 1934.

The merger has greatly enriched the life of each group. It has enlarged its field of activity, making it a nationwide instead of a provincial body. It has widened the fellowship and increased the missionary activities at home and abroad. It gave the body a new status among the major denominations of the country, through a doubled membership and a stronger representation.

The thirteenth merger is a triparty union between the Methodist Episcopal, the Methodist Episcopal South, and the Methodist Protestant Churches. This occurred in 1939.

The Methodist Episcopal Church, which is the parent body, traces its history in America to the year 1766 when Philip Embury, a local preacher, began to preach in New York and founded a Society of Methodists. Others, some eighty, followed him, and along with other religious bodies in America the Methodists severed their relation to the mother country and became an autonomous American body. On December 24, 1784, in Baltimore, the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized, with Francis Asbury as its first bishop.

It is needless to trace the history of this great body. When the slavery issue confronted the nation, it became desirable to divide the church into two sections—the North and the South—so at Louisville, Kentucky, in May, 1845, the Methodist Episcopal South was organized. This was done on a very amicable basis. The church had remarkable growth.

But in the second decade of the present century, with the Civil War and slavery a forgotten issue, the question of a reunion presented itself. Thus in May, 1914, the General Conference of the Southern Church outlined a plan of union to be submitted to the General Conference of the Northern Church. While these negotiations were going on, an invitation was extended to the Methodist Protestant Church to join the union. The Methodist Protestant body was the outgrowth of a controversy on the mutual rights of the ministry and the laity. The controversy, which continued over a period of years, reached its climax in 1830 when those who favored lay representation were officially expelled from the fellowship, who then organized themselves into what they called the Associated Methodist Churches. But in a few short years the two groups were reunited. Then a second division occurred which revolved around the slavery question. The Northern branch now joined with the Wesleyan Methodist Church and together maintained Adrian College, one of their foremost educational institutions. The Southern branch acquired Western

Maryland College at Westminster, Maryland. Finally the two branches were reunited in 1877, retaining the name Methodist Protestant. It had a combined membership of about 200,000, a growing missionary work in Japan, and a mission station in China.

Now in 1939 these three bodies, the Methodist Episcopal, the Methodist Episcopal South, and the Methodist Protestant, united to form the Methodist Church. This union has been very successful, and the combined strength makes it one of the largest and most influential bodies in American Protestantism.

The fourteenth merger is that of two societies among the Friends: *viz.*, the Religious Society of Friends—representing the General Conference—and the Religious Society of Friends of Philadelphia and Vicinity. This occurred in 1946.

The history of Quakerism is ably set forth in a volume prepared by Elbert Russell in 1942. As early as 1828 a split occurred within the fellowship of the Friends, forming three parties: Orthodox, Hicksite, and Conservative Friends. But with the beginning of the twentieth century these differences were less pronounced than before. The growing spirit of unity in the church in general had its influence upon the Quakers. The two world wars and the remarkable work of the American Friends Service Committee in the field of practical Christianity had much to do toward amalgamating these societies into a workable unit. Then in 1946 two of its societies merged into the Philadelphia General Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends.

We now come to the fifteenth, which is the last of the completed mergers among Protestant Denominations in America. This is the union of the Evangelical Church and the United Brethren in Christ under the name of the Evangelical United Brethren Church, which occurred as recently as 1946.

In a prior section of this paper a brief sketch of the origin of the Evangelical Church has been given. The United Brethren have a very interesting history. They originally represent a secession movement from the Reformed Church in the United States led by a Reformed minister named William Otterbein, in the year 1800. It was highly evangelistic in its methods and patterned its organization after the Methodist type. It grew very rapidly and recruited its membership largely from people who originally adhered to the Reformed and the Lutheran communions. There were hardly any two denominations in America that were more similar in doctrine, in government, in worship, in piety, and in type of membership, than these two bodies. It was only natural that they should eventually come together and thus constitute an influential body. The merger was brought about without any difficulty, and seems to work very satisfactorily for all that are concerned.

In this survey, I have limited myself entirely to such mergers as have already been definitely completed. Reference, in passing, however might be made to other attempted efforts at union, which are either in process, or are stymied for the time being. Among these are the union between the Protestant Episcopal and the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.; the union of the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. and the Southern Presbyterian; the union of the United Presbyterian and the Reformed Church of America; the union of the Congregational-Christian Churches and the Evangelical and Reformed Church; the union of certain Lutheran synods with each other, and more recently the Conference on Church Union which contemplates organic union of practically the whole of the Protestant Churches in America. This movement was inaugurated by the National Council of the Congregational-Christian Churches and seconded by the International Convention of the Disciples of Christ, and was launched at a preliminary conference at Greenwich, Connecticut, a year ago, and has lately held another meeting at Cincinnati.

A retrospect over these concrete cases, in which organic union has been achieved, leads us to observe that with few exceptions the unions have been reunions, divided members of the same household coming together. Several have been absorptions, where the larger body simply amalgamated the smaller group. The United Church in Canada is perhaps the most notable exception to this generally observed rule.

It will also be observed that practically all the major denominations have participated in one form of union or another. These are the Baptists, the Congregationalists, the Lutherans, the Methodists, the Presbyterians, the Reformed, the Evangelical, the United Brethren, the Evangelical Synod of North America, and the Society of Friends. It is somewhat surprising that the one church which across the years has so strongly advocated church union, *viz.*, the Protestant Episcopal Church—does not figure at all in the mergers that have thus far been completed. There is, of course, a reason for this, which is not a part of this study.

The ecumenical movement, while it is basic to the church of Christ, is a comparatively late emphasis in the program of the church. We must regard these fifteen achievements as initial stages, indicating possibilities in the progressive solidarity of American Protestantism.

Let us remember, however, that Christian unity in all cases is more desirable than church union. Christian unity denotes a spirit, while church union represents a form. If church union will eventually produce Christian unity, we should give it hearty endorsement and encouragement, but perhaps it is the other way round—Christian unity must lead to church union—and we must maintain the unity of the spirit, in the bond of peace, until the whole body is fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth.

TELEVISION: VISION OR SUBDIVISION

CHARLES H. SCHMITZ

Director Radio Education, Broadcasting and Film Commission
National Council of the Churches of Christ

TELEVISION simply means "the ability to see at a distance." A person at home pushes a button on his television receiver, and among all the comforts of home he becomes a ringside spectator at a football game, a parade, a theatre, or an important event making international history. He is *there* at home. He is there for free. He is closer to the event than the people who are there in person. The event has come into his living room with instantaneous sight and sound.

Television has many interesting facets. Its immediacy provides the thrill of being able to witness what is happening at that very moment elsewhere. There is no lag between the viewing of it and the happening of it. Its spontaneity heightens interest. Anything can happen on a live program. Errors creep in, even after many rehearsals. The spontaneity that brings the possibility of error is most refreshing. The unforeseen intrudes, not with less but with more entertainment value. A gadget may fail to work properly. An animal may forget its manners while on camera. A fragile prop may betray its weakness at a crucial moment. Witness the linoleum that was supposed to resist cracking as it was compared with its cheaper competitor's product, but then under camera the supposedly better linoleum cracked too. Products being advertised may resist a demonstration. These possibilities of error are always present. There are no retakes. Then there is the informality and intimacy of television. The screen brings the televised personality very close to the viewer, while the viewer remains fully relaxed in his living room. This informality and intimacy gets inside a person with profound effects. In all these matters television is technically superior in terms of contemporary life and human interest to all other existing means of communication. There is no doubt about that.

We have an all-inclusive medium in TV. It is not a carry-over from some other medium. It is like radio, and yet you see while you hear. It is like the movies, and yet it is not delayed mechanical reproduction; usually it is instantaneous viewing. It is like the theatre, but without the limitations of space, and it employs telescopic lenses and trick shots to add interest. It is like the newspaper to which is added moving pictures of the personalities and events in today's news. Television borrows from all mediums of communication, and yet has a technique all its own. It borrows from all, yet remains different.

The Impact of Television

Television has replaced radio as the more important product of radio and TV manufacturers. In 1949 two thirds of the industry's income came from TV sales, according to the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Statistics. This income from TV sales amounted to \$600,000,000 in 1949. In July 1951 there were 107 TV stations and 12,000,000 sets in use. As TV set ownership increases, the entertainment habits toward this medium will be built up more and more. The television industry has an estimated investment of over 3½ billion dollars including stations, receivers, transmitting facilities, manufacturing plants, etc. In contrast with this the capital investment of the film industry is estimated to be a little over two billion dollars. Major radio network programs have lost a considerable part of their nighttime audience.

Television has made its impact on newspapers and magazines. There are magazines and newspaper publishers who have already bought television stations in recognition of impending changes. Television has affected radio. Already at least one city (Baltimore) has a greater television than radio audience at night. Radio does continue and will continue, but not as effectively as heretofore.

Television has and is affecting the motion picture industry. Several hundred movie houses have closed. Some have gone on part time schedules. Television has cut seriously into movie going. Why dress up, why go through the hazards of driving downtown and finding a place to park, why pay out money for a show—when you can stay at home in comfort and be entertained, for free? To be entertained at home outweighs the urge to be a part of a crowd in a theatre. The conclusion of one survey made was that movie houses lose a little over \$40 in admissions per year from each TV family. Some have attributed this to the sheer novelty of television, and believe that when that novelty wears off attendance at the theatre will be resumed. But against this thought must be placed the fact that TV programs will steadily improve, will become more and more entertaining. Indeed there are some reports which indicate that viewers watch TV more now than when the set was new. Attendance at theatres has dropped twenty to forty per cent in TV cities.

Ministers having Sunday evening services are reporting that attendance is showing somewhat of a decrease, and part of this decrease is due to television's coming into the community. Other ministers having Sunday evening youth meetings only, are facing the urge of young people to go elsewhere at such times as significant TV programs may be on. Some churches now have television centres in which a room is set aside and a

TV receiver made available in it as a supplement to the recreation program of the church.

There is the possibility not too remote of subscription television where, by payment of a fee to the telephone company, Hollywood's latest films may be seen. Hollywood is interested because if this gains momentum every television owner becomes a box office prospect. Some have said that this would give first-run features an audience four times as great as they have today. Then there is theatre TV such as the box office success in theatre television's pick-up of the Joe Louis-Lee Savold fight, unavailable for the home audience.

The motion picture industry is watching television closely. Movie interests have heavy investments in television stocks and stations. When forced to relinquish part of their holdings, leaders of motion-picture companies have preferred to stay with their studios or production centres rather than with their chain of theatres. This is more significant in terms of filming for television in the future. Hollywood's aim has been not to displease anybody and to try to comply with the thousands of prohibitions aimed its way by pressure groups, religious and otherwise. The result has been that films out of Hollywood have been barren at times, seeking to feed the passive audience with something well watered down and universally acceptable. Does this mean that television in the future will have Hollywood feature films that will seek to get us excited for an hour about nothing in particular?

Hollywood has the greater percentage of copyrighted material under its control. Hollywood currently lives under the threat of change and competition. Whatever the outcome of that change and competition may be, one thing is certain. Television will remain a vision to Hollywood (a good or a bad vision)—it will not become a subdivision.

The Viewer

The person watching television views everything in terms of twelve or sixteen or nineteen inches. Screens are becoming larger. The largest direct view screen so far is thirty inches. He sees and hears through the home atmosphere. This may be good or it may be bad. Sometimes he sees blurring and flickering and lack of perspective. He sees programs gotten together in a hurry with no other purpose than to fill up time and space on the screen. He sees the reflection of the problems of terrific expense in production, of copyright restrictions, of growing pains. But for all that the viewer usually prefers TV to the movies and to radio.

The viewer demands action. He wants variety. He looks for interesting telegenic personalities. He expects sparkingly different background views. He hopes for something fresh and different. He is hard to please.

Needless to say, he does not always get what he wants. The result of all this is that TV writers are the most frustrated souls who work their hearts out for a show. The show is produced just once; that's the end of it. Usually there is no film made of it, no lasting impression.

The viewer says, "Entertain me!" The producer wonders just what it is that does entertain. He gives the viewer what he thinks is entertaining and then hopes for the best. Sometimes what he thinks is good the public thinks is bad. There are times when something simple and inexpensive has a larger audience than something elaborate and expensive. Top names do not guarantee top ranking programs. The telecasting of sports usually increases rather than decreases attendance.

A survey made at Chicago's South Shore high school disclosed that TV viewing helped seniors in history, civics, and drama courses. But there was a decline on an average of nineteen per cent in grades of junior class members who watched video nineteen hours weekly, and of $8\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in sophomore grades. Jack Gould of the *New York Times* in a recent series on TV pointed out that reports indicate that TV introduces children to new personalities, events, and topics and may improve their vocabularies. Psychiatrists and experts in child study have varied views on the subject.

Today's Health, a publication of the American Medical Association, in an article by Elizabeth Hurlock, Ph.D., offered this seven-point program for parents:

1. Do not ban TV, because that makes of it "forbidden fruit" and therefore even more appealing.
2. Where there are several choices of shows, let the child select the one he prefers.
3. Watch the program yourself along with the child and then discuss its merits and demerits.
4. Use TV for the purpose of encouraging the child's interest in the arts and sciences.
5. Do not confuse TV with paregoric—never use TV just to keep children "quiet and out of mischief."
6. Let the child consider TV as a privilege—so use TV as a reward.
7. Do not worry about the child's becoming a TV addict. The desire for TV will level off.

Pilot studies of TV program preferences have come to some tentative conclusions. From fourteen to seventeen hours are spent each week on an average by set owners viewing programs. Where there is a TV receiver in the home, this becomes that family's most important leisure time activity. Educational and cultural programs are preferred by the higher income families, but the preference is not too decided. Comedy and variety offerings seem to pull the larger audiences. There is no indication anywhere of

a great public demand for TV religious programming, although the networks and the local stations sense a need for it.

The educational possibilities of TV are tremendous. It will ultimately help to make the teacher's job more interesting and more effective. There is a miniature TV camera available for educational use. It enables a class to see a microscopic image on a television screen. Surgical operations have been televised for medical groups, providing close-up views impossible in such situations heretofore. Expert diagnosis of disease by specialists many miles distant from the patient may be possible. Iowa State College is now testing the educational possibilities of television through its new TV station. Iowa State is the only university to date having a complete TV station with cameras, studios, and transmitting facilities. Syracuse University has its own studio and cameras but must carry its programs on available time only, through an outlet commercially owned and operated, for Syracuse University does not own a TV station. Many universities have discovered that adult night classes are showing a decrease in attendance. A survey among fifty selected cities disclosed this decrease to amount to fifteen per cent, and indicated that the decrease is due to television's competitive interest.

Some forty-five colleges and universities, twenty-one school systems, and five medical schools are already busy preparing television programs for airing. Dr. Franklin Dunham, chief of radio in the U. S. Office of Education declares that about 180 more educational institutions are interested in similar ventures. The Philadelphia Board of Education has assigned a group of educators to coöperate with local stations in the presentation of from six to eight educational programs every week during the academic year. The Ford Foundation has made large contributions to educational TV. The Federal Communications Commission has made some important decisions favoring the allocation of channels for educational use.

A great service has been given by television in bringing the debates within the Security Council of the United Nations to the people. Russia's position could clearly be seen and heard for the first time in the person of Mr. Malik "on camera." The coverage of special events is educational. Congressmen can air their views. International personalities are brought into the home through interviews and roundtable discussions via TV. New books are reviewed favorably and unfavorably. All of these help the general understanding of masses of people. There is real vision here, and not a subdivision.

The effect that television will have on politics and politicians is yet to be measured. Will video help democratic procedures? Will both seeing and hearing our legislators at work help or hinder their reelection? Will sincerity come through political veneers? Some have said that future

political choices will depend in part on how telegenic the candidate for public office may be. So David Sarnoff, board chairman of RCA, said: "Television may well be a determining factor in choosing the next President of the United States. The eye, as well as the ear, will influence the vote. In choosing a candidate, it may well be that his television personality will be a deciding factor." Either way or any way with politics and with politicians television will be a vision and not a subdivision—whether for good or ill.

The Future

The Federal Communications Commission has authorized the American Telephone and Telegraph Company to link the east and west coasts with the first transcontinental circuit. The circuit will cost about \$37 million dollars, and is expected to be completed by 1952. The circuit will use coaxial cables, and there will be fifty-five microwave relay stations between Omaha and San Francisco.

The FCC also ruled in favor of the Columbia Broadcasting System method of color. This ruling has brought many objections and the case is being taken to the courts where restraining orders are sought. A real battle line among the competitors having other color systems or heavy investments in black and white TV has formed. What the outcome will be is anybody's guess, but it is fair to assume that black-and-white television will always be available and that color television is still many months away for the average viewer.

Dr. W. R. G. Baker of the Electronics Department of the General Electric Company declares that more than four hundred new TV stations will go on the air before the end of 1955, and that by 1961 there will be 666 stations in operation altogether. By 1960, seventy-five per cent of the families in the U. S. will be within range of at least one TV station, and eighty-three per cent of the buying power of the nation will be reached by TV by 1956.

The British television industry aims to give its fifty million people the best in television service. Britains are going after the international markets. The BBC operates under a royal charter having a radio and TV monopoly, and allowing no commercials. Revenue comes from licenses which every set owner must buy. A radio license costs \$2.80 per year, and for the privilege of having and using a TV receiver the cost is twice as much, or \$5.60 a year. During the next two years BBC plans to bring TV programs to practically the entire British Isles. Now only about one third of the area is covered. The combined radio and TV license income in Britain in 1949 was \$26,600,000. Of this amount the TV service with about one thousand employees received \$2,800,000. There is a drive on to sell

more and more sets in Britain. As far as is known, France is the only other country having a daily public television program. Sao Paulo and Rio de Janeiro in Brazil are presenting television programs. Mexico and Cuba are to begin this kind of operation within a year. Among at least some countries of the world television promises to become a vision and not a subdivision.

The Church and Television

Where does the church stand in its relationship to television? Pastors are feeling the impact in and around the cities where the 107 TV stations are located. It is becoming more and more difficult to hold evening meetings. Whether religious leaders wish to become aware of it or not, they will have to face it sooner or later.

There are certain signs that the Roman Catholic Church is aware of it. It constantly reminds the faithful that viewing the Mass over a TV receiver at home does not truly constitute sharing the Mass. The Roman Catholic Church knows the temptation of the American public to live more and more as spectators remotely observing events in comfort, and to share those events only through vicarious emotion. Our Roman neighbors are aware of the tendency to leave the stage of life to the few. At the same time, they are also aware of the terrific educational potential of this medium to promote their convictions. They know that their processions, rituals, ceremonies, sanctuaries, altars, and the like are far more suitable to the TV medium than are the usual Protestant services. When color television arrives, this will be even more apparent. At the same time our Roman neighbors know that just viewing the Mass without interpretation and comment is unimpressive and makes for dull programming. So they see to it that there is explanation and interpretation provided for every Catholic event that is televised. Large sums are being set aside to propagate the faith through video.

The Broadcasting and Film Commission of the National Council of the Churches of Christ is awake to the possibilities. The Commission sponsors "Morning Chapel" on WABD-TV in New York three days every week. On Sunday WPIX-TV presents "Television Chapel" at 7:15 in the evening, also a presentation of the BFC. Several television films on the parables of Jesus using puppets have been produced. More of these are coming. A spot film urging the viewer to attend the church of his choice has been prepared. In the planning stage are half-hour television network Christmas and Easter programs. A series of fifty-two TV films is to be made of the program called "What's Your Trouble?" with Norman Vincent Peale. A dramatic half-hour series called "Within These Portals" is also to be produced. Both series are intended for local TV use sponsored by local councils of churches or ministerial associations.

The Broadcasting and Film Commission recognizes certain TV responsibilities beyond the areas of program production at the national and local level. It knows that locally produced programs can be very effective. Therefore the BFC sponsors television workshops for ministers. Several have already been held at WHEN-TV in Syracuse, New York, where ministers are taught how to use TV wisely and well in their own community. (See *McCall's Magazine*, July, 1951.)

The Columbia Broadcasting System produces the TV program "Lamp Unto My Feet" every Sunday afternoon, and going to eight cities. It is estimated that the program is watched by 150,000 people. It costs the network about \$1,400 every week. A commercial sponsor would pay four times that amount. Yet the program is presented without cost to the participating religious groups. Young people are shown studying the basic principles of their faiths—the Roman Catholic, the Protestant, and the Jewish.

Rev. Charles E. Fuller is on television by film in a program called "The Old Fashioned Meetin'," in which the setting of a rural church is used and in which the singers appear garbed in the fashions of long ago. The type and style of singing is that used in his "Revival Hour" radio program. Mr. Fuller speaks from a pulpit. It is given on paid time, with requests for financial help.

"Youth on the March" with the Reverend and Mrs. Percy Crawford is another TV religious program. It features a full orchestra, a full choir and Mr. Crawford's four young sons. Testimonies are given. A brief sermon in a pulpit setting is given. Pleas for financial support are made. The program is given on paid time.

Special religious events have been televised. There have been pick-ups of the New Year's Eve Midnight Mass at St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York, the consecration of three Roman Catholic bishops at the Holy Name Cathedral in Chicago, and the Jewish confirmation ceremonies in the observance of Shavuoth at the Temple Isaiah Israel in Chicago.

A few religious television films are coming through. The Broadcasting and Film Commission is in process of building a film library for such use, but problems of copyright clearance and editing for TV are great.

The Reverend Dorland P. Dryer of Youth Films, Inc., Hollywood, California, is producing some religious films for TV, using the theme of the natural world as a background for religious values. He is also producing a weekly devotional film, five or ten minutes in length, and allowing for the possible use of the local minister as a part of the program. The Alexander Robert Currie Broadcasting Fund of the First Presbyterian Church of Hollywood is financing a series of Bible stories filmed for television. It was announced in June 1951 that the Lutheran Church,

Missouri Synod, will spend \$750,000 on a documentary, dramatic TV program. This would be the largest TV budget of any Protestant group. The Seventh Day Adventists recently appropriated \$350,000 for the medium. The Broadcasting and Film Commission's total TV budget for 1951 is \$9,959, representing twenty-nine communions and twelve interdenominational agencies of the National Council of Churches.

What may those of us do who sense the importance and power of this rapidly growing means of communication? What may we do to see to it that in programming religion is not set aside? How can we make television a vision and not a subdivision among denominational leaders, among our ministers, among our denominational educators?

The Vision of Television

In terms of our deep religious convictions what is there that we may do to relate these convictions properly to the medium of television?

We can express appreciation for the attempts already made and the programs already provided. It is most unkind during the infancy of a medium of communication to point only to the mistakes, the blunders, the omissions, ignoring the experiments that have taken so much time and effort. There should be an appreciation of the tremendous costs involved, costs that are many, many times greater than the costs involved in producing a radio program. That is true of even the simplest program.

We can become interested at the local level. We can visit the local TV station and gain some insights as to the problems involved, the techniques that are employed. Without asking for time or program we can first root ourselves in a better understanding of possibilities as well as limitations.

We can suggest to our colleges and seminaries that introductory courses in television be provided. We need to know how to communicate our knowledge through the twentieth-century means of communication at our disposal. If such courses are omitted, it can rightfully be assumed by the graduates that here is a means of communication that is of no consequence to the faith. Ministers from whose training TV has been omitted will be seriously handicapped through the years to come. What better way than this to reach the unreached?

We can ask the directors of our denominational and interdenominational life to become less concerned about protecting what we have been and to become more concerned about what we might become if we adequately reached the unreached. Television deserves more than the minimum of attention. It must be lifted from its ranking as a subdivision to become a real vision to and for the Christian faith. Can anyone anywhere name a better means to reach the unreached than radio and television?

We can urge a larger and fuller support of the Broadcasting and Film Commission. This agency is attempting a herculean task on a shoestring budget. It seeks to function on behalf of denominations, communions, and interdenominational agencies through institutes and workshops for religious leaders, and by producing more and better programs for local and network use. But the fulfillment of that vision depends so much upon the support it receives financially from its member groups. It is in the very nature of television programming that it may best be done coöperatively at much less expense. The skills necessary to it are most demanding. Support the BFC.

Through all these suggestions there lies the question as to how deep and vital our convictions concerning God and Christ really are. Are we really out to win others or are we anxious only to save ourselves? The writer was chatting with another pastor during a recent convention. The writer said that most ministers are not very interested in either radio or television. The few who are taking hold are sometimes those of the very fundamentalist type who welcome and seek television opportunities. We asked ourselves the question as to why this is so. Soberly my friend suggested an answer. He said, "Maybe they alone have a message!" We hesitate to conclude that the few ministers who do use television—that they alone have a message. And yet, is there another answer?

Surely, as with the early church, where there are deep all-pervading convictions, there will always be a way. The convictions create the will to use the means. The imperative of the message meets and solves the problems of how to communicate it to the world. We too have a message. The greatness of it asks that we make of television a vision, never a subdivision.

Westinghouse spends this year \$2,300,000 on TV over fifty-one stations for time, talent, and promotion of their program "Studio One." They are happy about it. "Studio One" reaches nine million people. A top Hollywood film running a whole year plays only to six million. The publicity director of Westinghouse pointed out that if the Broadway play "South Pacific" were to reach nine million it would have to play to a packed house for seventeen years! Each show costs Westinghouse \$43,400. Each show has three commercials, each for a different product. By dividing the audience into the cost per product advertising, Westinghouse claims that it costs them only \$1.60 to reach a thousand people in the customer's own home where the family is together under ideal conditions bringing about direct results.

Was it not Jesus who said "the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light" (Luke 16:8)?

Where Ignorance Is Bliss, 'Tis Folly

"OF ALL heretics, those whose lives are pure are the most dangerous." Such in substance was the pronouncement nearly eighteen hundred years ago of one of the most eminent fathers of the Christian church. Nor is the reason for his statement hard to understand. Those whose lives and actions are open to legitimate censure are poor advocates for any cause. Appeal to the old dictum, to which the passing years of experience have added increasing weight, is natural and crushing: "By their fruits ye shall know them." But those whose lives are of a sort to arouse respect, who seem on the basis of the most rigorous tests and the closest scrutiny to assay high, are in a position to be no mean champions for views which they hold dear. Thus a modern novelist can let his hero say: "You defended me, Padre. If men like yourself believe in Him, then I were a fool not to believe too." To some, as to the clergyman in the story, this type of reasoning may seem most shallow and unsatisfactory. It is nonetheless compelling to many; hence the danger as seen and fought against from Origen's day to ours. Precisely the qualities which we prize in ourselves and in those whose views we share, we regard with suspicion when they are evident in those on the other side of the tracks—especially the "theological tracks."

This principle appears to me universal; there is a neat example of it in a biblical writing which has long given interpreters concern. Twice in the letter to the Colossians (2:18 and 23) Paul makes use of the word commonly translated *humility* (*tapeinophrosunē*) in a most disparaging manner. This has seemed strange, for it is a quality which he demonstrably prized and which he regularly urged his converts to cultivate. Indeed, in the very next chapter it is one of the qualities which his readers, "as God's elect," are to "put on" (Col. 3:12).

For Judaism this quality had long been an especial virtue. "Humility of spirit" no less than contrition of heart insures God's abiding presence (Isa. 57:15). Indeed, it was a quality which God himself evidenced. Thus the psalmist can say without embarrassment, "Thy humility hath made me great" (Psalm 18:35). To be sure, we do not find that rendering in our English Bibles; instead we read in the ARV: "Thy *gentleness* hath made me great" and in the margin "thy *condescension*." But that is not what the Hebrew word (*anwatheka*) means. It is simply that through a feeling of mistaken reverence the Christian translators have not been able to bring themselves to posit such a virtue for God. When the same word is used of man (as, for example, Prov. 15:33; 18:12; 22:4), they render it naturally and accurately "humility."

For Judaism this was no problem at all, and this fact should not be forgotten when considering the justice of the oft-repeated contention that in Jewish thinking God has become so high and lifted up, as king of the world, so akin to an Eastern despot, that he had become completely inaccessible—to be feared, yes; to be loved and worshiped, no—and that to regard God as a loving Father was distinctly a Christian about-face. The

fact that this latter view has been constantly expressed and is still deeply intrenched in popular thinking does not in the slightest degree alter the facts, will we trouble to look for them. The contention is utterly unwarranted and has been frequently refuted, as every informed student knows. The actual fact was quite the reverse and is expressed simply and unaffectedly in the Talmud (Megillah 31a): "Wherever (in the Scripture) you find the almighty power of God, you will find in the context his lowly deeds."

This dominant note was constantly stressed. The rabbis delighted in heaping human qualities and attributes upon God: He was best man at the wedding of Adam and Eve; he teaches Torah to Israel and keeps school now in heaven for those who died in their infancy; praying himself, he teaches Israel how to pray; he visited Abraham when the latter was sick and mourned with Isaac at Abraham's death. What they protested against was not the addition of these humbler qualities to God, but the exaltation and deification of man. Thus, God is represented as saying to Moses: "Though I made thee a God to Pharaoh, thou must not become overbearing (and think thyself God); *I am the Lord.*"

Nor was this unnatural. As a revealed religion which took itself seriously as such, Judaism was confident that precisely as God had revealed the law, so the law revealed God. The qualities which men were to cultivate were thus of necessity the qualities of God himself. "Ye shall be holy; for I Jehovah your God am holy" has always been, quite regardless of what the word *holy* here means, a fundamental criterion for Jewish thought.

For early Christianity humility was thus a natural and central virtue. It was not so in the Greek world. Far from being praiseworthy, it was a despical quality. The noun itself does not occur in pagan writers before the Christian era; the adjective is common and almost invariably in the sense of mean-spirited, low, groveling, poor—precisely as Dickens uses it in the mouth of Uriah Heep, "Mother and me is 'umble." It is safe to say that one of the hardest tasks with which Paul found himself confronted was to convince his Greek converts that this was a quality worthy of one who was truly free.

Thus to revert to the troublesome passage in Colossians. It is conceivable that the word, even in Paul, had not become so thoroughly fixed in meaning that it could not be used in a different sense. Conceivable yes, but to my mind scarcely likely. Instead it appears to me but another instance of the natural tendency referred to in the opening paragraph. The teachers of false doctrine against whom he is warning the Colossians appear to have been champions of some sort of queer theosophical speculation in which angels, the "rudiments of the world"—in a word, some sort of cosmic demons—played a prominent part. Thus the humility of his opponents to these forces (*stoicheia*) not unnaturally seemed most reprehensible to Paul. Precisely the same quality shown by them to Christ would have aroused his admiration and praise. Zeal for a cause in which we do not ourselves believe always appears to us reprehensible. And the more estimable the contenders are and the qualities they evidence, the more damnable their zeal.

From Off the Campus and On

WITH THIS issue CROZER QUARTERLY completes her twenty-eighth year. She is by no means the oldest in the theological family, but she surely is no adolescent. And during the years she has seen many of her older sisters pass and several new ones appear. Best of all, she has won many devoted friends. These she highly prizes and hopes never to disappoint them. She would like more. During these years the subscription price has remained far below cost. This has been a deliberate decision. We believe that there is a place for such a journal and have been anxious that none should be prevented from reading it due to price. Only once in her lifetime has the subscription price been raised. With the value of the dollar what it is now said to be, our subscribers are actually receiving this journal at less than one half what they paid in 1924. We cordially invite our readers to bring their friends into the family. All of you are going to give presents this Christmas. Could you do better than to let CROZER QUARTERLY be among the gifts chosen for the more discriminating? A query to our business manager will bring pleasant information as to the material saving you will yourself receive while thus giving pleasures to your friends.

Dr. Cranston is no newcomer to these pages. Our readers will remember his many incisive and useful reviews. Since 1949 he has been dean of the School of Religion of the University of Southern California. He came to this position from Dartmouth, where for five years he had been Phillips professor of religion. Upon graduation from Dartmouth and Drew he had been a Methodist missionary in China for four years. In 1925 he received an A.M. from Columbia and six years later a Ph.D. from Harvard. He has also taught at Colgate, Redlands, and the Pacific School of Religion. It was at the last-mentioned institution that his present essay was delivered as the Earl lecture at the time of the inauguration of that School's new president.

Dr. Chester is an associate professor of English at the University of Pennsylvania. For many years he has made an especial study of the English Revolution and Hugh Latimer. A volume on Latimer is expected to appear in the near future. It is a pleasure to welcome this distinguished scholar to our pages.

Dr. Schaeffer is one of our "elder statesmen" in the field of churchmanship. After sixteen years in the pastorate he became secretary of the Board of Home Missions of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, which position he held until his retirement a few years ago. He is a former president of the General Synod of his church, of the Philadelphia Federation of Churches, the only surviving charter member of the Western Section of the Alliance of Reformed Churches throughout the World, and was for over thirty years a member of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. If ever a man was competent to write on the topic of this present article, Dr. Schaeffer would appear to be that man.

Our readers will remember Mr. Schmitz's earlier article, "Religious Radio in the United States" (October, 1947). Long a pioneer in this field of religious education, he now has not unnaturally included the rapidly developing field of television as part of his province. During his years in Syracuse as minister of the Calvary Baptist Church he was a member of many radio committees of church organizations, was himself a regular broadcaster, and eventually chairman of the Radio and TV Committee of the American Baptist Convention. He has recently become director of radio education for the Broadcasting and Film Commission of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America.

In the forty-four pages devoted to reviews and briefer notices of new books few readers will fail to find several volumes of particular concern to themselves and many reviewers whose judgment and learning they have come to prize. One of the pleasantest tasks in making up each issue is the listing of the many devoted experts who contribute so graciously of their time and talent. Dr. Andrews has been for many years head of the department of religion at Goucher. Mr. Baker is minister of the Second Baptist Church, Wilmington, Del. Dr. Banning is professor of theology at Bangor. Mr. Batten is dean and professor of religious education at Crozer. Dr. Bean is associate professor of church history at Crozer. Dr. Bond is head of the department of religion at Bucknell. Dr. Brush is professor of church history at Andover Newton. Dr. Cooper is professor of Old Testament at the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia. Dr. Dabney is dean and professor of homiletics at Andover Newton. Mr. Ellis is an instructor in the department of religion at Richmond. Mr. Enslin is professor of New Testament at Crozer. Dr. Flight is professor of Old Testament at Haverford. Dr. Gaines is head of the department of romance languages at Richmond. Mr. Gehr is minister of the Universalist Church of the Restoration, Philadelphia. Dr. Hamilton is professor of the history and philosophy of religion and Christian missions at Oberlin. Dr. Heck is president of the Evangelical School of Theology, Reading, Pa. Dr. Herrick is president *emeritus* of Andover Newton. Dr. Hershey is minister of the Lutheran Church of the Holy Communion, Philadelphia. Dr. Houf is professor of philosophy at Ohio University. Dr. Hough is dean *emeritus* of Drew Theological Seminary. Dr. Hyatt is professor of Old Testament at Vanderbilt. Mr. Keighton is professor of preaching and worship at Crozer. Dr. Kramer is Clark research professor of Assyriology at the University of Pennsylvania and one of the curators of the University Museum. Dr. McCasland is head of the department of religion at Virginia. Dr. McGary is a professor of philosophy at Wisconsin. Dr. Moehlman is professor *emeritus* of church history at Colgate-Rochester. Mr. Schmitz has already been introduced. Dr. Shrader is minister of the First Baptist Church, Lynchburg, Va. Dr. Sperry is dean of the Harvard Divinity School. Dr. Stanger is director of religious activities at Lynchburg College. Mr. Whitney is minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Camden, N. J. Dr. Wright is professor *emeritus* of philosophy at Dartmouth. Dr. Young is assistant professor of New Testament at Yale.

BOOK REVIEWS

A Faith that Fulfills, by Julius Seelye Bixler, New York, Harper, ©1951, pp. 122, \$2.

Dr. Bixler writes as president of Colby College. It was his distinction in other years to have been sensitively sympathetic with students in his classrooms. It is reassuring to find that his present duties as an administrator have matured rather than dulled that quality of his mind and heart. Would that all glorified office boys in high academic positions might share his point of view.

As an educator Bixler is an apologist for modern youth. He does not despair of the "younger generation" because he understands it so well. These brief chapters—being the Ayer Lectures at Colgate-Rochester Divinity School in 1948—take their start with entries from the diary of a Colby freshman in the year 1833. The final chapter returns again to the religion of the modern college. But the intervening chapters envisage our times as a whole and therefore include ourselves as well as our college-age offspring. Bixler would agree that the approach to religion, on the part of the undergraduate and thus of ourselves, has changed radically in the intervening century, but he does not think that the modern generation is less religious than its predecessors were.

He concedes some of the perils of our present situation. Colleges may easily become ivy towers for escapists. But so may our churches and our traditional liberalism in general. All of us are in danger of becoming "bystanders" in history, watching its action from the bleachers, rather than participants. Neoorthodoxy charges our whole liberal culture with having sinned the unforgivable sin of *hybris*, pride. In the academic world this pride is a pride of intellect, not of money or political power or race. Perhaps so; it is very hard to become letter perfect in the Christian art of suffering fools gladly!

Here, as in his previous writings, Bixler is the undaunted adversary of the cult of irrationalism, which is so much the fashion of the day—particularly in many of our theological schools. Being a man of generous mind he concedes the warrant for some of the neoorthodox criticisms of religious liberalism. Such concessions are characteristic of liberalism; since neoorthodoxy cannot concede any criticism of its dogmatic premises. Father Tyrrell once said of Catholicism, "If Rome cuts her little finger she bleeds to death." Much, if not most, of the newer Protestant orthodoxy is in the same parlous state; it is liable to a sort of *hæmophilia* from which many of the worn-out families of Europe have suffered; it may be full-blooded, but it is "a bleeder." Bixler points out very rightly that the cult of irrationality has always invoked reason to vindicate its irrationality. This paradox—since the ancient days of *credo quia absurdum est*—is constant and familiar.

A very useful chapter is devoted to Kierkegaard, as the father of much of our modern neoorthodoxy. Bixler is more than fair to that quixotic, yet pathetically sincere, Dane. He wisely does not attempt to psychoanalyze his subject. His account of Kierkegaard's "existentialism" as "the experience of the Christian believer as he develops his spiritual powers, faces crises, makes decisions, and summons his whole personality to meet the demands of faith" is important. It raises the question why this religiously positive interpretation of life has now lapsed into the skepticism, nihilism, and pessimism in the existentialism of Sartre and Camus.

There are interesting chapters on the rationality of the Hebrew prophets and

on the religious ministry of art. Amos, Micah, Hosea, and Isaiah gave concrete content to the vast abstractions of justice, mercy, and humility. Art is basically religious in that it attempts to bring order out of chaos, to unify life. It is an end in itself, yet needs fulfillment in the terms of truth and goodness as well as in its own end, beauty. A final chapter discusses the rhythm of life with its law of alternation, which compasses both the life of contemplation and the life of action.

By far the most interesting, suggestive, and important chapter in the book is that on "The Ministry of Pain." Bixler's freshman of a century ago was hagridden by a sense of sin. The modern undergraduate seems to have little awareness of sin, and to our liberalism as a whole the awareness of "Sin," with a capital "S," is apparently an almost unknown experience. The incantations in that name, which are a stock in trade of neoorthodoxy, awaken little response in most modern minds. This loss of the old sense of sin does not mean, however, that the present generation of youth is guilty of what has been called "the blasphemy of optimism." Youth as it matures its own self-consciousness is always introspective; it cannot be otherwise. But as reason is supplemented in the youth of today by an awareness of beauty, so it is supplemented by an awareness of suffering. The "heavy and the weary weight" of the pain of our world burdens modern youth, which is more sensitive to suffering, more tenderhearted, and more generous than the generations which have preceded it. In place of the solitary sense of sin with which our fathers were obsessed we have today this awareness of involvement in universal suffering.

Bixler thinks that the substitution of the latter experience for the former is a religious gain, not a loss. Had he taken time to do so, he might have elaborated and illustrated his thesis by an appeal to the examples of Saint Francis, John Woolman, and the like, who had little to say about sin in traditional terms, but much to say of the sufferings of the world which became the occasion for their vocation to the religious life. To this extent Bixler thinks that we are, at least in the person of modern youth, more Christian than we were a hundred years ago, since at our best we are "moved with compassion" for the pains of our world, rather than preoccupied with ethical self-analysis. Here, as throughout the book, Bixler suggests lines of thought which lead far beyond the necessary limits of his six lectures and his hundred odd pages. Running true to his liberal instincts, he is generous to his hearers and readers. He has begun a very suggestive book which he bids us finish for ourselves.

WILLARD L. SPERRY

Communism, Democracy, and Catholic Power, by Paul Blanshard, Boston, Beacon, 1951, pp. x, 340, \$3.50.

Blanshard has done it again. When the manuscript of his earlier *American Freedom and Catholic Power* was ready for publication, it went the rounds, and publisher after publisher turned it down. It was too controversial. It wouldn't sell. It would endanger their sale of other books, might even entail a boycott. The Beacon Press took it and proved their competitors wrong. It did sell, and in a big way. Attempts were made to suppress it, to misrepresent it, and to laugh it off. They boomeranged as CROZER QUARTERLY predicted they would. To be sure, a certain New York newspaper of national renown refused to carry paid advertisements of it and some department stores were afraid to carry it on their book counters—several of the timorous but canny ones did sell it "under the counter." Those well-documented facts simply offered additional proof of the honesty of the statements in the book as to the powerful and unscrupulous pressure which could be exerted

in—to use a mild term—a most un-American manner. In short, the book was a big success. The venomous but unsuccessful smear campaign both authenticated its content and provided wonderful publicity and astronomical sales as no advertising, however clever, could have done.

Then came the second volume two years later. And again there were qualms, this time of a different sort. Could it be done again? Would the new book stand on its own feet? Would it prove a dud? The last question seemed to be answered by the amazing prepublication orders from booksellers who had learned to be brave, if and when the sales warranted. A reading of the book answers the second question. It is far from a rehash of the earlier book. Instead it is an independent and very important volume.

The author's thesis is that, despite their hatred, the one for the other, and despite certain obvious contrasts (which in uncritical eyes seem all-important), the Kremlin and the Vatican are conspicuously similar all down the line in aim and action. Both are absolute monarchies; both hate and fear democracy and are set for its destruction. Both demand allegiance which, if zealously rendered, makes the individual so acting violate the laws of this land.

In twelve telling chapters Blanshard examines and compares these two bitter rivals for world domination. And in the course of the methodical, nonemotional, factual, and documented treatment he strips very bare the meretricious, if widely accepted, contention that the Roman Catholic Church is the greatest natural ally against communism. Of course the Vatican is hostile and is eager for a holy atomic war of extermination, but it is not because she is a champion of what we have come to feel the American way of life. Rather, it is because there is no room in this increasingly small world for these two champions. Cæsar must slay Pompey, or Pompey will destroy Cæsar.

This book has already been contemptuously derided by occasional Catholic politicians in commencement addresses in Catholic colleges just prior to receiving strangely inappropriate honorary degrees. But a thoughtful reading of the book does not bear out their words. It is hard to see how any American who has been accustomed to a democratic way of life can find offense in this book, provided he can be convinced that what Blanshard says is true. And the evidence cited would certainly seem conclusive.

At the moment, in America, public opinion is such that the searching analysis and devastating exposure of communism will arouse no ire but will be readily accepted and welcomed. There is far more danger that many will tend to minimize or soft-pedal his indictment of the aims and methods of the Vatican. This is serious, for there is a greater menace in the Vatican than in the Kremlin. True freedom is under at least as vigorous and studied attack, but the menace is cloaked, for the ways are far more subtle. It is idle to seek to hide this issue. Freedom is in danger when "freedom" is restricted to mean: freedom to believe what is true, with the Vatican the sole arbiter of what this "true" is; and when conversely a rigid censorship on Catholics and a vigorous attempt through political and economic pressure and even through legislation to impose it on non-Catholics as well are maintained to prevent all candid appraisal, not to mention adverse criticism, of her policies, however un-American they may seem. That studied, long-range attempt to stultify intelligence, not her mediæval theology, is the greatest menace from ecclesiastical Rome.

In the last chapter, after the exhaustive consideration point by point of the similarities and dissimilarities between these two foreign powers—for the repeated claim that Catholicism is simply a religion is nonsense—Blanshard ends with a brief

but telling section, "The American Answer," in which he lists simply but cogently what his study of the evidence leads him to feel the proper procedure. The three demands which he argues America has the right and obligation to make to the Vatican appear to me proper and important: ". . . that the Vatican cancel for the United States its rule against Catholic attendance at public schools; that the Vatican grant to all Catholic Americans the moral right to study both sides of every social question, including material critical of Catholic policy; and that the Vatican recognize American marriage and divorce as valid." Were these to be granted, it would be a deal easier to believe that Roman policy were a bit more in line with the claims which are made in this land where it is still necessary for fascists to walk a bit gingerly.

This is deliberately not a review. The book appears to me important enough to be read in full. These paragraphs are frankly designed to that end.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

A Life of Jesus, by Edgar J. Goodspeed, New York, Harper, ©1950, pp. 248, \$3.

We are fortunate to have a "life of Jesus" from the hand of Professor Goodspeed who has made such a great contribution to New Testament studies in our century. Motivated by a genuine passion to tell the story as he has come to understand it, he writes with a simplicity and conviction that renders his book exciting reading from beginning to end.

In general Goodspeed follows the Markan order of events supplemented by materials from both Matthew and Luke (with greatest confidence in the historical reliability of the latter). The active ministry dates from the baptism by John and the temptation experience which immediately followed. The early period of the ministry is marked by a succession of works of wonder; as a "doer" of remarkable deeds he first meets the populace. The author, while accepting the miracle stories as a very important part of the ministry, vacillates between a rationalistic and nonrationalistic explanation. But in contrast to what has been called the "modernistic approach" he recognizes that the miracles are integral to the gospel portrait of Jesus and not mere addenda. The teaching is placed largely in the latter part of the ministry. His most important teaching session is recalled in the Sermon on the Mount. Professor Goodspeed says we have in this masterpiece "the program of a new day in man's morals." In it "he said enough in two hours to change the current of mankind." It is a "little gospel all by itself."

A mounting conflict with the Pharisees, who are soon joined by the "Herodians" (tools of Antipas), over Jesus' treatment of the "law" provides the matrix out of which the dramatic climax of the cross emerges. Conscious from a very early period of his Messianic rôle and his inevitable death, Jesus, like Isaiah before him, chooses a group of disciples (from the followers of John the Baptist) who are to carry on his work after his death. These faithful followers he instructs, utilizing the parable as the chief mode of instruction. Recognizing the certainty of his death, Jesus determines to die in as "dramatic" a manner as possible: a way that will never be forgotten. And so he journeys to Jerusalem for the first time in his ministry, where the combined efforts of the Pharisees and "Herodians" are sufficient to bring about his end. He makes a supreme effort to forestall his end until he has achieved the reinterpretation of his Messianic rôle in terms of the "suffering servant" concept and the transformation of the Passover meal into a meal memorializing himself and his work. This he accomplishes. Goodspeed places great emphasis on the cross as

central to Christ's work. It is "sacrificial." But beyond the assumption that it fulfills Isaiah's prophecy he does not go. It is "a sacrifice to God on men's behalf, which solemnized a new covenant between God and men." The *why* and the *how* are not discussed.

The principal substance of Jesus' preaching is the kingdom of God. He not only preached it; it is something that Jesus began. "He inaugurated it, and undertook to carry out the greatest task ever conceived—to set up the Kingdom of God on earth" (p. 64). The kingdom was not something to be achieved in the future; it had already come. But what the kingdom really means to Jesus Goodspeed never makes clear even in general terms. He speaks of it as "an attitude" of good will and love. He refers to Jesus as "setting up his Kingdom in the world" (pp. 64, 156, 134); the kingdom must "win support" (p. 187). The principal difference in the kingdom as preached by Jesus and by John the Baptist and the prophets is that Jesus sees it as a promise and not a threat (p. 47). It is not to be dreaded but welcomed (p. 48). The element of judgment is largely eliminated. The real difference between Jesus and the prophets in terms of relationship to the kingdom is that Jesus "realized and proclaimed that it was here." With the complex implications of this statement Goodspeed does not grapple.

After thirty years of work by the exponents of *Formgeschichte* it is interesting to see that Goodspeed in his reconstruction of Jesus' life completely ignores their labors. Furthermore, the problems raised by Weiss, Wrede, and Schweitzer are not made specifically evident. The gnarled problem of the eschatological background and foreground of Jesus' teaching is by-passed. Both the "secret" of Wrede and the "mystery" of Schweitzer have disappeared. This undoubtedly reflects a sincere and considered judgment of the author. In the light of the magnitude of the problems how helpful it would be to have the reasoning and logic which have led him to his present position. But in his appraisal of the Judaism of Jesus' day, especially the Pharisaic movement, the reviewer believes Professor Goodspeed has assumed an indefensible position and attitude. To refer to the devotion of the Pharisees in general as "abject devotion" (p. 114), to say unequivocally that Pharisaism had made religion an "aristocratic privilege" (p. 183), or that Judaism as the Pharisees developed it "was essentially a calculating religion" (p. 82), is, to say the least, a misrepresentation of the Pharisaic movement. To say the most, it places an unnecessary burden of understanding and charity upon the shoulders of the average reader for whom the book is largely intended.

In his preface Professor Goodspeed writes that no biography of Jesus "can be written without emotion." This is true because his life is a record of great emotions—"of commission, temptation, devotion, compassion, surrender and sacrifice." One cannot be a stranger to these emotions and penetrate to the meaning of the life. Certainly this book repeatedly in vivid and moving terms recaptures these "emotions" of Jesus. But the author rightly contends that the emotions were inseparably related to convictions. And it is at the point of these convictions (*e.g.*, regarding the kingdom) that one may legitimately challenge the author's interpretation of his sources. To recapture the emotions, as essential as that may be, does not inevitably insure recovering understanding of the meaning of the convictions undergirding them. It will without a doubt contribute to the writing of a book with genuine vitality; this book exudes vitality. It is in verity a "life" of Jesus; and it is obvious throughout the book that the life of the subject has been the object of the lifelong thought and devotion of the author.

FRANKLIN W. YOUNG

The Praises of Israel, by John Paterson, New York, Scribner, 1950, pp. x, 256, \$2.75.

This book takes its title from the name by which the Book of Psalms is known in the Hebrew Bible: *Tehillim*, "Praises." Professor Paterson wrote this volume because of his conviction that there are too few books dealing with the Psalter, in comparison with those on the prophets and lawgivers of the Old Testament. His primary purpose is "to show the enduring vitality of *the Praises of Israel* . . . [and] to show how the Psalter grew like a living thing and how from the beginning it was closely entwined with the life of the worshiping community" (p. vii).

The book is divided into three parts. Part I, "A Golden Treasury," deals in general with the nature of the Psalter and its growth over a long period of time, and gives the results of recent critical research on the Book of Psalms. In this section the author properly gives credit for the most creative work on the Psalms in modern times to two continental scholars: the German, Hermann Gunkel, author of a large commentary on the Psalms in the *Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament* (fourth edition, 1926) and *Einleitung in die Psalmen*, completed after Gunkel's death by J. Begrich (1933); and the Norwegian, Sigmund Mowinckel, author of *Psalmenstudien I-VI* (1921-1924). The former of these two scholars is responsible for the classification of the Psalms into types according to literary forms and the usage of the Psalms in the ancient worship of Israel, which is explained in detail in the present volume, chapter 4 of Part I. Mowinckel has emphasized the importance of the connection of the Psalms with the cult life of ancient Israel, and has elaborated a complex theory regarding a New Year's festival which he thinks had tremendous importance in the cult of the ancient Hebrews. In commenting on this theory, Paterson says that Mowinckel and the scholars who have followed him "have ventured further than the available evidence permits and have moved too far under the influence of a most seductive idea" (p. 36). On the problem of the relationship of the Psalms to the ancient cult, Paterson is more inclined to follow Gunkel than Mowinckel. His position is well summed up in these words: "Thus our view of the Psalter will be that it originated first in the cult, from which the forms are derived, that later it passed outside the cult to the homes of the people to become the deposit of their deepest religious life, and that finally it returned, varied and enriched, to beautify the cult and bequeath to us our present book of Psalms" (p. 54).

Like most recent commentators on the Psalms, Paterson exhibits little interest in the dating of individual Psalms. He believes that the historical references are usually too meagre to make reliable dating possible. Yet, in general, he agrees with Gunkel, Albright, and others that many of the Psalms may be relatively early, as against the view of Duhm that the Maccabean age saw the composition of many Psalms. "It is doubtful if any psalms in our Psalter originate in a period as late as that of the Maccabees (165-37 B.C.);" (p. 79).

The second part, "Types and Interpretations," is devoted to a detailed exposition of ten Psalms, chosen to illustrate the main types in Gunkel's classification. The ten chosen are: 103, a hymn of praise; 46, a "Song of Zion"; 44, a lament of the community; 2, a royal Psalm; 51, a lament of an individual; 23, a Psalm of trust; 15, a Psalm dealing with the law ("Tora liturgy," as Gunkel calls it); 90, a Psalm of mixed type; 124, a song of national thanksgiving; and 82, a prophetic Psalm. The exposition of these Psalms is marked by deep appreciation for the religious experiences which lie back of the individual poems, and for the religious ideas expressed in them. The interpretation is usually very sane and abreast of modern scholarship. This reviewer believes, however, that Paterson's expositions would be more useful if he had given greater attention to the literary form of the

Psalms. He rightly insists over and over that the Psalms must be interpreted as poetry, and thus with imagination and literary appreciation. He is aware of the work which has been done by Gunkel and others on literary forms. It is surprising that he is content to reproduce the King James version with its usual verse division at the head of each chapter. He does frequently quote the Metrical Version published by the Oxford Press and used in many Presbyterian churches, and occasionally he gives his own translation of individual verses and passages. Yet, very little attention is given, for example, to strophic structure, which can be of tremendous value in the interpretation of some of the Psalms. Furthermore, in these expositions Paterson does not give as much attention to the use of the Psalms in the ancient worship of the Hebrews as Part I would lead one to expect.

Part III is entitled "The Religious Teaching of the Psalter." Here we are given brief summaries of the teaching of the Psalter on the following subjects: God, the divine revelation, "religion in life," sin, retribution, and the life hereafter. It is frankly recognized at the outset that the Psalter represents the work of many individuals over a long period of time, and that one cannot expect to find a theology in the Psalter. These chapters are useful, but many readers will find them less valuable than the preceding chapters because of the necessarily sketchy treatment that must be given the various subjects. It is interesting to see that Paterson finds the possibility of a doctrine of future life, which is something more than the usual Old Testament expectation of going to Sheol, in Psalms 16, 17, 49, and 73. He may well be correct for Psalms 49 and 73 (where the poets are probably thinking of translation after the manner of Enoch or Elijah), but this reviewer doubts that Psalms 16 and 17 have to do with the hereafter at all.

This book on the *Praises of Israel* should prove very useful to laymen who want to know what modern scholarship is saying concerning the Psalter, and it should lead them to more intelligent and appreciative reading of the Psalms.

J. PHILIP HYATT

The Belief in Progress, by John Baillie, New York, Scribner, 1951, pp. viii, 240, \$2.75

Recent trends in theological thought would lead us to think that the question of progress has become a purely academic discussion. Its critics have contended that the whole idea was based on a false claim for the rôle of reason, which had been absolved from the turmoil of passions, and exalted above the turbulence of historical forces. If the idea of progress has not become wholly anathema, it has at least been relegated to the shadowy realm of the twilight of the gods, from which it is not to be recalled. And it might be granted that, from the vantage point of the present, the weaknesses and heresies of a positivistic philosophy, which engendered a too quixotic faith in progress, are quite evident, as is the superficiality of a faith that misinterpreted external technological progress as if it met all the requirements of real progress. But in spite of these obvious criticisms, the question is still relevant whether the idea of progress is a possible, and perhaps a necessary idea. Are there not good grounds for affirming that there ought to be progress? Does it not have its proper place in the Christian scheme? Recognizing that the idea of progress has faded in recent years, Dr. Baillie comments: "this is a prospect in which none can be so insensitive or hard-hearted as to rejoice; a situation the possible disastrous consequences of which it is difficult to overestimate. For what after all, is left for modern man to believe in, if he can no longer believe that the

future is likely to be better than the past, or that his children's children are likely to inhabit a world less full of wrong than he himself has had to live in?" (p. 180).

One of the merits of Professor Baillie's book is that it traces the many strands of thought that have gone into the fashioning of the modern belief in progress, from the Greek historians to the German idealists and the French encyclopædists. In fact, the "pattern of progress" which he traces sustains the impression that the idea of progress is tied in with the major demands of a philosophy of history that can match and supersede a pessimistic and cyclical view of history. A whole new outlook on human history is involved in the point of view that begins with the Hebrew conception of events as meaningful, and culminates in the notion of a cosmic evolution.

But the account is not one of untempered optimism, or of enthusiastic zeal in the defense of progress. The author distinguishes sharply between progress which is purely external, consisting of scientific advance and technological control over the environment, and a genuine moral or spiritual progress, representing an increase in wisdom and virtue, and in the total goodness of the human race. Only the former can be empirically substantiated, he contends, while the latter is supported solely by an *a priori* faith. Thus, "to express it epigrammatically, observed progress is mainly technical, whereas believed progress is mainly spiritual" (p. 156). The error of the modern protagonists of progress has been largely that of equating and confusing the two.

In a section dealing with the "availability of the presuppositions," Professor Baillie considers whether the various components of the modern liberal theory of progress can make good their claim. It is scarcely justifiable, he holds, to apply the evolutionary theory to other realms than the biological, and to posit a cosmic evolution; for in the sidereal, geological, and chemical orders, there is involved no evident process of adjustment to the environment. Moreover, this evolutionary theory rested in part on the thesis of the German Enlightenment, that reason and its principles are inherent in the processes of nature and of society. But this is a speculative principle of what Whitehead calls "high generality," which blurred the distinctions between the realms of nature and grace. In turn, these assumptions trace back to the original creed of Descartes, Francis Bacon, and the French "philosophes," that the human reason, aided by legislation, was unlimited in its capacity to solve our problems. Such a faith has not been justified, because all triumphs of human discovery are "ethically ambivalent, as capable of being used for evil as for good . . . for destruction as for salvation" (p. 177).

But the idea of progress does have its place in Christian thought, Professor Baillie contends, and it ought not to be surrendered. For the great difference between pagan civilizations and the Christian movement derived mainly from the fact that while the former were invariably pessimistic, Christianity came not merely with a new faith, but also a message of hope. For only in the Hebrew-Christian outlook is there any real historiography, in which "historical experience plays a determinative part. . . . The biblical outlook is in the fullest sense historical" (p. 86). This accounts for the fact that "it is within Christian civilization, and nowhere else, that the modern belief in progress has arisen" (p. 94). If therefore the belief in progress is a heresy, it is a Christian heresy, exaggerating a Christian affirmation at the expense of others. Nevertheless, it arises from the Christian conviction that the decisive battle against evil has been won, and that we are now living in the years of grace. There may be a longer time between the decisive battle and Victory Day than the early Christians believed, but the issue has been made clear. Professor Baillie agrees with the interpretation of Dr. C. H. Dodd, that the viewpoint of the New Testament

is that of "realized eschatology." He also shares the thought of Dr. Oscar Cullman in maintaining that when the first Christians affirmed Jesus to be both Lord and Son of God, they meant that "following His victory over the powers of evil in His death and resurrection, He now rules as King" (p. 208). With this hope, and the enthusiasm of the missionary movement, the New Testament provides the faith from which the belief in progress derives its true Christian meaning.

There is still room for questioning whether Professor Baillie has made a serious attempt to relate sacred history with secular history, in his conclusions about progress. Is the only ground for the belief the hope that somehow progress will spill over from the former realm into the latter. In that connection it might also be asked whether he has done sufficient justice to the rôle of reason in human history. A quixotic faith in reason may be mistaken. But has it not also played its part in at least creating a context and a climate in which man may adjust himself to his environment with more confidence, in which also he learns of his own dignity, and respects the dignity of his fellow men. This could be, it seems to me, one of the many ways in which we ought to seek a more meaningful relation between the realms of sacred and secular history, and thereby avoid the danger of isolating the Christian interpretation of history. Nevertheless, this work of Professor Baillie merits high praise for restoring a measure of balance in outlook, over against those who are too ready to throw all ideas of progress and of a forward moving history into the discard.

ANDREW BANNING

God in Education, by Henry P. Van Dusen, New York, Scribner, 1951, pp. 128, \$2.

This "tract for the times" is the expansion of a lecture delivered at the University of Pittsburgh in 1947, repeated at Rice Institute in 1950, to which have been added two more. Then, apparently as an afterthought, a pontifical pronouncement upon "Religion in Public Education" was inserted, not even dignified as "Chapter 4" but like Melchizedek is printed here "without father and without mother."

The orator's problems begin at least as soon as p. 19, where Douglas MacArthur's distinctly erroneous assertion, "Our problem is basically theological," is once more quoted with unction. No, no! Our problem is the lag in theology. Theology requires infusions of ethics if it is ever to rise from its deathbed.

The president of Union Theological Seminary does not confront his second problem, for after making Descartes his *bête noire* for our sour situation, he observes that the troublemaker remained a "devout Roman Catholic" to the end of his life. Precisely, "there's the rub"!

Since God has always been in American public and higher education, although often more in the timetable, biology, chemistry, and athletics than in the "confrontation theology," the author misses his mark here too, for an indirect approval of religion in a physiology classroom is worth five formal courses given by the "paid" professor of religion. It was the failure to observe the significance of the indirect approach to religion in the modern university that caused the president completely to miss what Jefferson was doing at the University of Virginia when he assigned the courses in religion to the professor of ethics—as radical an innovation as has occurred in the American university.

As I was marveling how a president of an American theological seminary could have published the Melchizedekian addendum, I happened to turn to a review of an essay by him on "The Coming Great Church" in *Essays on Christianity* in the *Manchester Guardian Weekly* (May 10, 1951, p. 4) in which the reviewer wrote: "He

seems to me to write too much from his own point of view and I doubt if five-and-twenty, let alone five, decades will see the 'Great Church.'" My problem was solved. The same is true here. *Religion in Public Education* is a merely theologically infallible *ex cathedra* deliverance. His authorities seem in error, and the American people will no more arise for him to correct the unanimous United States Supreme Court than they did at the solicitation of the Catholic bishops. In fact, the reaction to his chief authority has set in, and brilliant legal minds too numerous to mention are pointing out that complete separation is to be permanently with us. One-half hour with the shades of Philip Schaff, who taught church history at the Union Theological Seminary and in 1888 published a pioneering brochure on church-state relations, would have furnished him at least ten major points to reflect upon.

If, as an innocent laymen, Mr. Van Dusen felt the urge to criticize the United States Supreme Court, he should at least have done a little reading in Beard, Butts, Childs, Greene, A. Johnson, Pfeffer, Thayer, Wright, Waite, Cooley, Cushman, Murphy, Rutledge, and Black—to mention a few—not one of whom we find in his bibliography. "Equal and just aid" to all religions and the multiple establishment theses are dead if not buried.

And Madison and Jefferson just cannot be transformed into supporters of the all-out aid hypothesis. Jefferson must have made another impression upon his contemporaries, if even in the 1860's he is still being described as the "very underminer of the Union and a most mischievous ferret." Indeed, Jefferson's counterattack against his opponents must have been very sustained when we recall that he wrote of the Presbyterians—"the most intolerant of all the sects, the most ambitious and tyrannical, ready at the word of the lawgiver, if such a word could now be obtained, to put the torch to the pile and to rekindle on this virgin hemisphere the flames in which their oracle Calvin consumed Servetus."

For historical reasons, then, we must prefer Church Historian Schaff of 1888 to Theologian Van Dusen of 1951.

CONRAD HENRY MOEHLMAN

A Fresh Approach to the New Testament, by H. C. G. Herklots, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, ©1950, pp. 176, \$2.

Both the author's preface and the publisher's jacket raise hopes that are not met in this small and quite readable book. "The key to the understanding of the New Testament documents is that they are the *propagandist literature of a wide-spread and successful missionary movement*." The use of the term "propagandist literature" may be new, but the basic idea is old. More than a century ago F. C. Baur called the gospels *Tendenzschriften* and insisted that they be understood in the light of their historical context rather than in the ways current up to 1847. More than thirty years ago Professor Martin Dibelius of Heidelberg wrote his first sketch of what became a significant approach in New Testament study, that of *form criticism*, one of whose basic tenets is that the content of the Synoptic gospels was determined by the necessities of the early Christian preaching. Dibelius wrote an Introduction to the New Testament under the same title as the volume under consideration. For his book it was an altogether suitable title. Dr. Herklots' "fresh approach" has been implicit for a long time in the work of other scholars. That the Christian movement produced the New Testament has long been a well-established fact.

The reviewer accepts the author's terminology that the New Testament is propagandist literature, but the result of this acceptance is a recognition of the

necessity of careful employment of the basic tools of literary and historical research. She finds it difficult to understand how an author who accepts the New Testament as propagandist literature, with the overtones of successful pamphleteering which the term connotes, can so completely succumb to the propaganda and treat it as straight history instead of as a one-sided story, slanted to the needs of a given group, and how such an author can ignore the unfairness latent in such an approach, an unfairness that has dogged Christian history from that day to this in the acceptance of the Christian propaganda on the relationship of the Christian missionary movement to the parent religion, Judaism, to mention only one albeit striking example.

That the author has accepted the propaganda as history is obvious in the five chapters where the book of Acts figures prominently. It is a primary source for that major missionary propagandist, Paul. No distinction is made between statements corroborated by Paul's letters and statements which are only assumptions. To be sure, this is the time-honored use of this book, but why does it appear in an allegedly "fresh approach"? Recognitions of methods common in hellenistic historiography has saved some scholars from this type of error. But the temptation to take Acts at face value is very strong, and in a day when there is a renewed drive toward a strong Christian apologetic, we are in danger of forgetting that a rigidly historical approach is still sound.

In a book with the title of this one there is an amazing amount of statements embodying views hoary with age: I Peter is by the apostle Peter (in spite of its Pauline content and its source in a situation of persecution); Luke's writings attest his medical knowledge (an idea exploded in 1919); Mark is in all probability the young man who fled naked and escaped to write his gospel, after also being the probable source of the Gethsemane story, to mention only a few.

In the chapters not dependent on Acts the chief defect is a superficiality unavoidable in such brief chapters: *i. e.*, less than fifteen pages to "Rival Faiths"—magic, mystery cults, philosophy (Stoicism), Judaism; and seventeen to the four gospels. In a book obviously written for popular consumption moot questions are passed over lightly, such as the Aramaic background of Mark, Q (author, Matthew) Proto-Luke, the invalidity of the form-critical approach to Mark, who was Peter's interpreter, and the Gospel of John as a corrective to the Synoptic tradition, and the necessary basis for Christian thinking.

The most likely audience for this book is the adult Bible class. Its short chapters, its easy style, its general adherence to conventional views will counteract the effect of the terms "fresh approach" and "propagandist literature" in conservative circles. The book may sound radical, but its essential conservatism is attested by the proposal that Luke's birth narratives may stem from the Virgin Mary herself! One teacher of college students regards it as milk and not meat for the young adults who are being introduced to the New Testament through the work of those scholars who do not confuse propaganda with history.

MARY E. ANDREWS

The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings, by Edwin R. Thiele, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, ©1951, pp. xxi, 298, \$6.

Where do we date the schism of the Hebrew kingdom? About 936 or 930 or 922? Was Ahab's death at Ramoth-Gilead, after Qarqar, in 854 or 853? When was the call of Isaiah? How soon after 747? Did Samaria fall in 722 or 721? And was Jerusalem destroyed in 587 or 586? Students of Old Testament history have been continually plagued by these various and uncertain dates. The basic

reason for this is that the figures relating to the reigns of the Hebrew monarchs in the Books of Kings are indeed mysterious, not by intent, but in effect. They simply do not add up.

Professor Thiele attacks this problem anew, stating it succinctly in chapter 1 and discussing the contributions of the Septuagint, Josephus, and modern chronologists from Ussher to Albright in chapters 9-11. The heart of the book is in chapters 2-8, with the conclusion in chapter 12. Here the fundamental principles on which the author has proceeded with his argument are elaborated with patient skill and scholarly exactness. The doubtful dates cited above may now be confidently fixed at 931/30 for the schism (all biblical dates run from either about April or October of one year into the next); Qarqar, 853 (pp. 48-53); call of Isaiah, 740/39; fall of Samaria 723/22 (pp. 122-127); and fall of Jerusalem, July 19, 586 (exactly 2,536 years to the day this review is being written!).

The first principle on which Thiele reconstructs the chronology of the Hebrew kingdoms is that the calendar year in North Israel was reckoned from Nisan (March-April) to Nisan; in Judah, from Tishri (September-October) to Tishri. The evidence is lacking for this in North Israel; but it is reasonable to suppose that current Egyptian practice influenced Jeroboam (p. 33). The Tishri-Tishri calendar for Judah is demonstrated by the figure of *seven* years for the building of Solomon's temple (I Kings 6:38). This is one year short if his reign began in Nisan, since from the second month of his fourth year to the eighth month of his eleventh year (I Kings 6:1, 37 f.) embraces *eight* years unless his reign did not begin until some time after Nisan (p. 31). Other ideas about this have prevailed in others' chronological systems. But Thiele shows his principle to work smoothly throughout.

A choice must be made in any scheme between antedating or postdating the first year of a king's reign. Both systems were in ancient use: Egypt antedated and Assyria postdated. With the former, the actual year in which a monarch ascended the throne was accounted his first year; according to the latter, the remaining months of that year were known as his accession-year, and his own first year began the first of the year following, according to the civil calendar. Thiele shows that Judah used this latter accession-year system until brought under the influence of the House of Omri in the middle of the ninth century. Then she shifted to the North Israelite nonaccession-year system. At the beginning of the eighth century Judah returned to her original accession-year system. Israel had just converted to it at the close of the ninth century. Assyrian influence, of course, was responsible for the fact that through the eighth and succeeding centuries the two Hebrew kingdoms followed the accession-year system of the Assyrians and Babylonians. The previous practice of North Israel, to which she also attracted Judah in the half century after Ahab, was apparently of Egyptian derivation, like her Nisan-Nisan calendar (p. 67). Again, all through the tangled synchronisms of the Books of Kings, to the end of North Israel's history in II Kings 17, this principle works out exactly.

A third principle of Thiele's reconstruction is the assumption of a number of coregencies. These may often be reasonably inferred from biblical data, although not clearly stated. By assuming their occurrence, the author is enabled to accept all figures as to the length of reigns without alteration. In all he posits nine coregencies in the two kingdoms. For example, it is shown that Jotham must have been coregent with Uzziah for twelve years, reigned alone for four, and had Ahaz as coregent for four more. This explains perfectly the biblical figure of sixteen

years for his actual reign (Uzziah became a leper) in II Kings 15:33 and also the synchronism of II Kings 15:30 which gives him credit for his full twenty (p. 116)! Operating with the foregoing facts in counting the years of reigns and calendar months, and this third principle of coregencies, with no allowance for interregna, Thiele demonstrates that his chronology really works within the limits set by biblical data.

Lastly, the absolute chronology obtained from Assyrian eponym lists and from the citation of eclipses therein is shown by Thiele to fit the biblical data exactly. In this connection he offers a brilliant solution to the problems of interpreting the fragmentary records of Tiglath-Pileser III (chapter 5).

Upon these bases Thiele has reconstructed the chronology of Kings without a single attempt at emendation of the Bible text. This is an amazing achievement. It will stand as the definitive treatment of the problem and enable us to correct every other historical work on Israel down to and including the latest publications of Professor Albright. Every student of Thiele's book will find it, in Professor Irwin's phrase, a "wholesome corrective for Old Testament scholarship."

CHARLES M. COOPER

François de Fénelon, by Katharine Day Little, New York, Harper, ©1950, pp. x, 273, \$3.50.

This readable study of the great French prelate is written with the intensity and sympathy kindled by the beauty of his character, the idealism of his motives, and the power of his intellect. "I am writing this," says the author, "for all those who cherish acquaintance with stanch and valiant characters, sensitive and gifted souls, in the hope that their lives will be enriched by a knowledge of one more man of such caliber." There is a strength and poetic delicacy in the style of Katharine Day Little reminiscent of the writing of the archbishop himself, who was a charming stylist and a competent teacher of such matters.

No "beginning biographer," as the author describes herself, could have selected a more difficult subject for a first attempt at biography, for of all the great figures of seventeenth-century France he is perhaps the most complex. Her estimate is correct when she speaks of him as being "fluid, unpredictable as the current of a rushing river"; but to have painted so well a character whose expression is continually changing is all the more creditable. Almost every adjective summoned to portray him—*gentle, contemplative, urbane, chimerical, liberal, tolerant*—must be accompanied by the very opposite.

Essential to a true perspective of this many-sided personality is the historical background of the latter part of the reign of Louis XIV, which the author sketches with accuracy and skill. It was a turbulent, complex period during which the stringent formalism imposed upon social etiquette, politics, and religion was like brittle ice over a restless stream. Dissenters, individualists, those unable to rationalize the prescribed rules, had to walk gingerly. Fénelon steered his course well at first. Brilliant, energetic, devout, charming in personality, successful in every undertaking, he was at the height of his career when, at the age of thirty-eight, he launched himself into an adventure which lost him his favor at court, the support of his protectors, and ultimately led him to disgrace and exile. This costly adventure was the famous quarrel over quietism, that exaggerated form of mysticism introduced into France by Mme. Guyon and her followers.

In leading up to her discussion of the great debate the author shows how the rigid orthodoxy created a restlessness that encouraged atheism among some people,

or a yearning in others for a deeper, yet simpler, spirituality. Thus the soil was prepared for a resurgence of mysticism whose roots the author admirably traces far back into the early history of Christianity. At this point, however, when the author comes to deal specifically with quietism, Mme. Guyon, and the rest, the treatment leaves something to be desired in the way of factual documentation and impartiality. In vain will the reader search here for a concise statement of the differences in the mysticism of Molinos, the fanatical quietism of Mme. Guyon, and the milder form espoused by Fénelon. He will find, too, that in her desire to exculpate Fénelon, the author has given but a partial and too favorable portrait of that noisy quietist, Mme. Guyon; while the same motive throws Fénelon's antagonist, Bossuet, too deeply into the shadows. In the bitter controversy that shook the church from top to bottom and filled the pages of many a pamphlet, both men lost temper and poise; but Bossuet, it seems to most scholars at present, was no more at fault than Fénelon. In this book Bossuet is accused of writing "hysterically" and of exhibiting in this struggle a "sensational violence" which may be accounted for by "his own spiritual cowardice." Here again the author, who is usually quite free from bias, gives the impression of having fallen into an error characteristic of the *fénelonien* who, to paraphrase slightly the words of M. Bremond, *pour mieux exalter Fénelon, croit nécessaire d'humilier Bossuet*.

In connection with this affaire the author makes questionable use of a quotation when she writes: "Bossuet's battle with Mme. Guyon was finished, everything had gone his way. He felt that he had rescued the church from the pernicious doctrine of *Short and Easy Method of Prayer*. However his victory did not bring him happiness; rather, it had tended to make him less sensitive to his spiritual roots." Then he is quoted as having written, presumably *after* the battle: "I tremble to the very marrow of my bones when I consider the lack of depth in myself. . . ." This rings like genuine remorse, but the flaw is that the quotation comes from a letter written to the *maréchal de Bellefonds* twenty-three years earlier. A book of this sort might appear pedantic if it gave dated sources, but even pedantry is preferable to inaccuracy.

For the remainder of the book, however, the highest praise is deserved. The beauty of Fénelon's latter years, his noble deportment in exile, his devotion to his people and to the duties of his diocese were manifestations of the fundamental integrity and greatness of a soul that could turn defeat into victory, regain the sympathy even of his enemies, and win the admiration of posterity. Katharine Day Little's picture of this period of his life is exquisite. Her appraisal of Fénelon as a spiritual director and as a writer of spiritual letters reveals a genuine appreciation of this, the greatest of his talents—his ability to point the way toward truth and light.

A backward glance over the total career of this man brings to view now a personality whose diversity of activity, whose complexity of attitude, were but the varied effects of an essential unity of purpose: Fénelon strove incessantly for perfection—perfection in himself, perfection in others. And while he was aware that the Absolute forever eludes the human grasp, he knew that humanity must never relax the struggle toward it. It would seem most fitting to call this book what the author calls Fénelon's letters, "a spur to holy living."

WILLIAM J. GAINES

The Royalty of the Pulpit, by Edgar DeWitt Jones, New York, Harper, ©1951, pp. xxx, 447, \$5.

Sooner or later such a book had to be written, and providentially Edgar DeWitt Jones was foreordained to do it at this particular time. A master craftsman himself,

he is uniquely qualified to appraise the labors of his pulpit peers, elevated to the high rank of Lyman Beecher lecturers on preaching. The author has been a lifelong student of the Yale series, knows twenty-seven of the seventy men under consideration, and has sent questionnaires to the living lecturers to ascertain their reactions when the Yale invitation came and their method of preparation. When Dr. Jones writes on the Beecher series, a distinguished writer is perfectly matched to a great lecture-ship, one which began in 1872 with Henry Ward Beecher, and which has called to its platform seventy-five British and American homiletical stars of the first magnitude.

Dr. Jones has been so bold as to attempt a classification of the lecturers in ten categories. There are the Olympians, for example, ten of them, including, of course, Beecher and Brooks. The Titans number nine, Fosdick being among them. Two are Men of Letters—Henry Van Dyke and John Watson. Others appear as Schoolmen or Shepherds; yet in many cases it was difficult for the author to draw the line. Indeed, by his own confession, this classification cost him more travail of mind and soul than any other part of the book.

The chapters bear the names of the lecturers, and contain fascinating thumbnail biographical sketches, together with analyses and evaluations of the respective addresses. Significant excerpts from the various lectures greatly add to the value of the book, for they constitute a miniature series for those who do not have ready access to the complete volumes.

The closing chapter, "After Eighty Years," is a rich miscellany of interesting information concerning such items as the size of the honorarium, the training and denominational status of the speakers, the way in which the lectures were delivered, and, more important, the manner in which they were received. Even so kindly a man as Dr. Jones can speak plain words when certain lecturers fell below par. On the whole, however, as the author indicates, the entire series has been uniformly of superior quality. In this final chapter weightier matters are dealt with, such as noticeable preaching trends, both as to content and style, during the lifetime of the Yale series. The section dealing with the effect of the radio is worth careful study. In conclusion, Dr. Jones reaffirms his faith in the future of the Christian pulpit, and apparently agrees with Beecher that "true preaching is yet to come."

Dr. Jones does not hesitate to say that it is high time that a Negro be invited to join the "Glorious Company," and expresses regret that "no one conspicuous as an evangelistic force has yet honored the Course," as, for example, the late Dr. George W. Truett, of Dallas, Texas. In this connection let the present reviewer, who is a long-time admirer of Dr. Jones, and who for twenty years has used the Yale lectures in his homiletic classes, rise to nominate Edgar DeWitt Jones as a future Lyman Beecher lecturer!

Take it all in all, *The Royalty of the Pulpit* is an outstanding contribution to preaching, and should be owned and reread by those who would improve their own pulpit utterances. The book is beautifully written in a lofty style, with homespun touches here and there to sustain interest or reveal that even Titans can be human. The scope and thoroughness of this noble and highly successful undertaking leave one lost in wonder and admiration. The title, of course, suggests a chapter in Silvester Horne's great book, *The Romance of Preaching*, and no better summary and challenge can be given than to close with these words of Dr. Jones, "By *The Royalty of the Pulpit*, I have in mind the unique nature of the Christian pulpit, the halo of majesty, romance and noble traditions which crown the preacher's high calling and mission."

VAUGHAN DABNEY

Here I Stand: A Life of Martin Luther, by Roland Bainton, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, ©1950, pp. 422, \$4.75.

This is more than just another biography of Martin Luther. *Here I Stand* is also an interpretation of Luther and his times. Dr. Bainton has written a very scholarly yet very readable volume in which one does not find it difficult to keep going.

Luther's background and boyhood receive only scant attention, but the period from his decision to become a monk to the end of his life is covered in considerable detail. The entire work is fully documented, but the plan followed causes a rather considerable loss of time to the one who wants to learn the source of a certain quotation. He has to turn to the back of the book, find the number of the page on which he was reading, count down the page to determine the line, turn back to the key to abbreviations, and then, perhaps, to the bibliography, to learn the source! But this makes possible a complete volume with no distracting footnotes—a feature which will appeal to many readers.

Several excerpts from Luther's letters and sermons help the reader to understand the spirit of the great reformer. Professor Bainton does not sidestep any of the charges which have been made against Luther. The latter's attitudes toward the Anabaptists, his share in the Peasants' War, his suggestion that Philip of Hesse should practice bigamy, etc. are not whitewashed. But they are viewed in the light of Luther's own thought and the conditions of his day. An example of this is to be seen in the author's treatment of Luther's attack on the Jews:

In Luther's later days, when he was often sorely frayed, news came that in Moravia, Christians were being induced to Judaize. Then he came out with a vulgar blast in which he recommended that all the Jews be deported to Palestine. Failing that, they should be forbidden to practice usury, should be compelled to earn their living on the land, their synagogues should be burned, and their books including the Bible should be taken away from them. One could wish that Luther had died before ever this tract was written. Yet one must be clear as to what he was recommending and why. His position was entirely religious and in no respect racial. The supreme sin for him was the persistent rejection of God's revelation of himself in Christ. The centuries of Jewish suffering were themselves a mark of the divine displeasure. The territorial principle should be applied to the Jews . . . (pp. 379-380).

The liberal use of woodcuts, drawings, and engravings adds to the book's interest and value. These are from the author's collection which he has built up as a hobby, and they help to make the volume worth more than its modest cost.

RAYMOND J. BEAN

Hostages of Civilisation, by Eva G. Reichmann, Boston, Beacon, ©1951, pp. 281. \$3.

This study of the Jewish problem is devoted to the social causes of anti-Semitism in Hitler Germany, but the conclusions which it reaches have important implications for anyone who is interested in philosophizing about the Jews the world over. The book is worked out in four major chapters, like a drama in four acts. A penetrating introduction analyzes the experience of emancipation and asks whether, as a great many ardent Jewish writers are now proclaiming in their frantic effort to arouse support for the Zionist enterprise in Palestine, emancipation has been, is, or of necessity must be a failure. The convincing answer which Miss Reichmann arrives at in the four chapters of her book is a most reassuring No! She approaches from the point of view of a social psychologist, which, it would seem, is the right angle on this problem. I think that the book should be recognized as a major contribution to this particular branch of psychology.

The first chapter deals with anti-Semitism as a special case of group tension. The

main contribution here is the distinction between objective and subjective causes of anti-Semitism. The author deserves great credit for her ability in recognizing that there are very substantial objective reasons for this phenomenon; and even greater credit for her honesty in writing them down. It takes courage for a Jewish writer to make this admission in these days when social ostracism is being used with such deadly effect. The kernel of the objective or genuine Jewish problem, writes Miss Reichmann, arises from the fact that when two groups live together there is an inevitable dislike of the stranger and a demand for group homogeneity. Genuine anti-Semitism, therefore, like antigoyism, is rooted in the realities of group relations, and the intensity of these attitudes will be conditioned and limited only by the degree to which integration and assimilation have erased the lines of group demarcation. This type of anti-Semitism will be natural and inevitable so long as the homogeneity of the Jewish community is preserved.

This objective element in anti-Semitism, however, is greatly intensified by the subjective leanings of individuals, such as the need of self-assertion and aggressiveness, which in turn follow the psychological channel of displacement and rationalization and find their favorite outlet in group antagonism. The position of the Jewish group makes it a suitable victim of aggressiveness. Jews are late-comers, weak, ubiquitous, recognizable, associated with extremist movements, hold a precarious socioeconomic position, as a result of history are concentrated in money-lending and petty trade, and they are predominantly urban. The subjective causes of anti-Semitism have been much more deadly to the Jew than the objective.

Chapter two, which deals with the epoch in which emancipation became a fact, shows that that period of history was characterized by social, moral, economic, and political upheavals which were ideally suited for the development of such social phenomena as anti-Semitism.

The scene, developed in chapter three, is Germany, in particular the nazi Third Reich. Germany lacks natural frontiers and access to the sea. Her economic development was delayed, and there was a gulf between her middle class and the intellectual *élite*. Immaturity characterized her life. Western liberal ideas, once championed by the intellectuals, were repudiated and supplanted by an obsessive nationalism and romantic nostalgia for a mythical past. This was aggravated by Prussian leadership and manifested itself in pan-Germanism and intellectual anti-Semitism.

The fourth chapter, or last act of the drama, presents the catastrophe of Hitlerism. Here the author shows that the success of the nazis was not due to their political program, a prominent part of which was anti-Semitism, but to the skill with which they "ruthlessly gratified the passions of the weary and desperate masses." Hitler compared the masses to a woman who longs to submit to "the ruthless force and brutality of a strong man," leaning on Freud, so that the frenzy of the people has the rapturous, orgastic character of feminine masochism. Hitlerism, like every totalitarianism, is a religion rooted in consecration and devotion. Hitler had learned profoundly from Roman Catholicism, the religious despotism in which he was born, of which he was jealous and which he hated. Hitlerism became the overwhelming German religion, with its faith, theology, and rituals. Hitler was God and the Jew was the devil. Every great religion has to have a devil. Think of Satan, Ahriman, and Iblis. These come from the great monotheisms. (I might add that in the Far Eastern religions, while there are innumerable devils in the form of dragons, the real devil is *karma*, an impersonal force, and that the devil of Russian communism now is American capitalism, and vice versa. Neither could prosper without its devil.)

But it was not inevitable that the Jew should become the devil of nazism. Numerous other flaming religious nationalisms have had other devils. Mussolini, Stalin, and other vaunting despots through the ages have had their own devils, without attacking the Jews. The particular catastrophe of the Jews in Germany resulted from a unique situation which will not necessarily be duplicated anywhere else.

S. VERNON MC CASLAND

Sir Walter Raleigh: A Study in Elizabethan Skepticism, by Ernest A. Strathmann, New York, Columbia University Press, 1951, pp. ix, 292, \$3.75.

It seems strange to us today that a man's atheism should be determined by his belief about the size of Noah's ark, about the date of the creation and age of the world, about the credence to be given to astrology. It would seem equally strange to call a man a skeptic who believed, on hearsay evidence alone, in a race of men in Guiana whose heads do not appear above their shoulders, whose eyes are in their shoulders, and whose mouths are in the middle of their breasts. The age of Elizabeth was such an age, and Sir Walter Raleigh was the accused atheist and skeptic.

Strathmann has undertaken a study "to reexamine in their Elizabethan setting the charges of atheism which Sir Walter Raleigh's contemporaries made against him and to survey anew his religious and philosophical beliefs" (p. 5). The term *skepticism* is used of the study because *atheism* has too varied meanings and *rationalism* is too positive for the state of philosophy in the times indicated. But skepticism need not here presuppose religious disbelief or a systematic philosophy of doubt. It means rather "a tendency to question authority and to submit prescribed beliefs to the test of experience or experiment" (p. 7).

After an examination of the varieties of Elizabethan meanings of atheism—disbelief in one God, in a world that is not eternal, in the immortality of the soul of man, in the Scriptures as the Word of God—the author subjects the writings of Raleigh to the questions customarily asked in the confutations of atheism and the trials of atheists. These centred about God and the soul, God as the Architect of fortune, miracles, and men before Adam. It is concluded that Raleigh's reputation as an atheist "is traceable in large part to the Catholic polemics against him . . . and to the casual usage of 'atheist' in moral censure" (p. 271). He appears rather as one who shows no radical departure from the dominant religious beliefs of his time and country. It seems equally wrong to accuse him of a skepticism directed against social custom and so against the mores of his time and place.

The question of his being a philosophical skeptic is quite another matter; here he must plead guilty. Here we have his essay "The Skeptic," in effect an incomplete translation of *Outlines of Pyrrhonism*, a work of about A.D. 200; statements in the preface to his *History of the World*; and his handling of certain subjects in the body of that work. From this study Raleigh emerges as a challenger of Aristotle and in similar questions outside the realms of religious faith a believer in the freedom of challenge and inquiry. Skepticism was for him not a system of doubt or a philosophy of inquiry, but rather the weapon to be used against dogmatism.

The author concludes that Raleigh was "neither the Elizabethan 'atheist' (save perhaps in the broad implications of ethical criticism) nor the freethinker of twentieth-century fame, but a leader in that energetic company who did not find religious faith a barrier to philosophical and scientific speculations" (p. 275). The conclusion is quite warranted by the excellent and thoroughgoing investigation of the author.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

Protestant Thought in the Twentieth Century, edited by Arnold S. Nash, New York, Macmillan, 1951, pp. xii, 296, \$3.75.

In religious thought it is advantageous to have a periodic stocktaking. Here we have a group of reviews and prognostications in twelve chapters by scholars from ten institutions. For the reader, regardless of theological bent, this makes interesting and profitable reading.

Dr. Nash assures us that we are at the end of the Protestant era. This is indeed a period of crisis. Everything is changing, many things radically so. Secularism has carried us away; religion has thinned down; modern so-called Protestants believe and do so many compromising and contradictory things that they would not be acknowledged by early protesters like Luther and Calvin. "The 'Protestant' era has really ended, and we go forward into an age that many informed observers call the post-Christian era . . . [but] for the coming new age the Protestant principle still has relevance."

Discussing study of the Old Testament, Ernest Wright of McCormick Seminary sees much to have been accomplished by European scholars in the earliest decades of this century. However, it was too exclusively analytical and literary. Elaborating on Wellhausen's documentary theory, scholars lost sight of the search for the will of God in the literature and of its relevance for the work of the church. The coming of form criticism did something to recover the ancient tradition and to see the literature against its real background. Archæological finds have given us much new material. W. F. Albright is a new Moses to lead us out of bondage to the older interpretative stereotype. His "Mosaic monotheism" is in the right direction. Study of the Old Testament must be more than "a search for values"; it must be a scholarly, reverent digestion of "the record of a proclamation of the great saving acts of God, a proclamation which is primary." We greatly need to emphasize biblical theology, and to provide adequate commentaries from that viewpoint. "The renewed interest in theology is certainly the dominant characteristic of the Biblical scene."

Concerning study of the New Testament, Floyd Filson presents one of the most adequate chapters. He insists upon the uniqueness, unity, and permanent authority of the New Testament message. The Greek text has been established. Further study is required concerning Gnosticism, hellenistic Judaism, and the Septuagint. The books of Acts and John especially require more study. Some reliable system of dating the New Testament books is much needed. Above all is needed a biblical theology, "an interpreted account of the Biblical history, seen as the advancing work of God Himself." And in that theology the church must loom large as in New Testament times.

Philosophy of religion and systematic theology are separately discussed. Walter Horton sees liberalism to have been ascendant from 1900 until about 1920. The next fifteen years saw much controversy and realignment. Outstanding at this period was the work of D. C. Macintosh. After 1935 came the newer realism and neoorthodoxy. The struggle between neonaturalism (headed by Wieman) and neosupernaturalism (headed by Reinhold Niebuhr) has continued until now. "Humanists still exist—graduated in thousands each year from our secularized universities; but their faith in man has been greatly chastened." Christology is to be the core of the coming theology. Niebuhr, Ferré, and especially Tillich may do for us the big job now required.

Other chapters discuss Christian ethics, church history, pastoral psychology, preaching, Christian education, the Ecumenical Movement, and our relation to other religions. Dr. Mackay says: "Christianity is the absolute religion because in Jesus

Christ, who is the perfect revelation of God, the absolute meaning of life, and so life's absolute value, has appeared. . . . Christianity is essentially the religion of the Incarnation, of the fact that God became man for man's salvation." The surveys and forecasts are richly informative. The over-all impression is conservative, almost neoorthodox; certainly evangelical. The bibliographies are one of the best features of the book.

HORACE T. HOUF

The Early Arabian Necropolis of Ain Jawan, by Richard LeBaron Bowen, Jr., New Haven, American Schools of Oriental Research (Supplementary Studies Nos. 7-9), 1950, pp. 70, n. p.

A result of archæological researches begun when the author was an engineer with the Arabian American Oil Company in Saudi Arabia, the present monograph grew to a truly competent and fairly exhaustive treatment of the burial mounds of Arabia.

Such mounds exist all over Arabia, but here a group in the vicinity of Ain Jawan on the Persian Gulf is studied. Dozens of these are discussed: most of them are two to six feet in height; and one cone mound is twenty feet high, the Chamber Mound with four graves in alcoves. Various types of tombs are noted: some built of limestone blocks, some rock-cut, most of them accessible only from the top and covered with stone slabs.

One Himyaritic inscription (the seventh such to be found in the Persian Gulf area of Arabia since the mid-nineteenth century) is described, dating from about the fourth century B.C. Some pottery appeared in the tombs and much of it in one mound with no burials. The larger part of the pottery is dated in the "Hellenistic to Roman Period" (c. 300 B.C.—A.D. 300), though some comes evidently from pre-hellenistic and some from early Islamic times. Skeletal remains, scattered and incomplete, show that the tombs had been entered at an earlier time.

It is fortunate that so much material was available as is here treated, since great damage had been done to many of the mounds by the oil company's bulldozers in clearing ground to blast the underlying rock for use in the manufacture of concrete.

Extended discussion is given the interesting problems of the relative population and cultivation of the region in ancient times when the land supported perhaps several times the present population. Evidence of a veritable network of abandoned tunnel wells or underground waterworks and of irrigation ditches shows that fairly intensive agriculture was once carried on. It seems that the encroaching sand, either blown in by winds or moved across by shifting dunes, led to disuse of the irrigation systems, consequent decline of agriculture and decrease of population. Hence the old ruined water systems, buried villages, and sand-drowned palm groves do not indicate natural desiccation of the whole region, as some have supposed.

Two chapters are appended, one by F. R. Matson on "Technological Notes on the Ain Jawan Pottery," which should prove valuable for future excavators in Saudi Arabia; another by Miss Florence E. Day on "Historical Notes on the Pottery." Accurate dating of the mounds and materials awaits further archæological operations in Arabia, and this according to W. F. Albright "is about to enter a fruitful phase of activity."

JOHN W. FLIGHT

Self-Understanding, by Seward Hiltner, New York, Scribner, 1951, pp. xiii, 224, \$2.75.

New sciences often appear forbidding and nonunderstandable to the layman because of the strange terms used. Yet there is something to the remark, often

jokingly made, that "science is common-sense knowledge put in logical order and unknown terms." Dr. Hiltner's book, *Self-Understanding*, is an attempt to make psychiatry and psychotherapy understandable to the layman. This is done in the light of the recognized fact that religion, or the "cure of souls," has for many generations been concerned with the same problems of self-understanding. Religious prophets and priests, teachers and preachers, as well as countless men and women without benefit of any special training, have for ages attempted to help men discover themselves truly in the light of what they could know about God and the greatly involved web of human relationships in which they lived. Dr. Hiltner points out the fact of which we are often terribly aware, but which needs to be restated; namely, that complexities and tensions have so greatly increased in our modern day that more and more individuals are plunged into the defeat of confusions and frustrations. Many of these difficulties could be solved, if men really understood themselves, the psychological springs of their activity, the defenses they erect, the subterfuges they resort to, and their deepest longings.

Dr. Hiltner's effort to make strange and difficult psychological or psychiatric terminology understandable to the layman, in the opinion of the reviewer, hits the mark at many points. On the other hand, there seems to be some overdoing in this direction. The discussions of "Dated Emotions" or "Knotty Conscience," for example, would probably be clearer if less figurative and more descriptive terms were used. Fortunately, there is a wealth of very apt case material used throughout the book. One can easily recognize the type of experience treated, even though he may be a little confused by the terminology used.

When one reads some of the modern treatises on the psychological analysis of human nature and the dire consequences of not understanding clearly all that modern scholarship has to say about the nature of man in his human relationships, it seems strange that man has been able to endure, to develop, and to produce, in the way that he has actually done. Dr. Hiltner points out in very simple and convincing ways the fact that man has always had a great deal of wisdom, that by religious and intellectual insights he has been able to make sense out of himself and his world and has been able to create magnificent works. What man needs now is not so much a new world and a new God, but an honest, intelligent, and devoted way of understanding himself in relation to the God of his fathers and the world of things and relationships they have known and cherished. This, if wisely done, will lead to new insights, new and better ways of action, and new and vaster creativity.

CHARLES M. BOND

An Introduction to Philosophy, by Edgar Sheffield Brightman, rev. ed., New York, Holt, ©1951, pp. xvii, 349, \$3.60.

Ordinarily philosophers (like old soldiers according to General Mac Arthur) when they retire, quietly "fade away" and are forgotten. However, this will not be true of Professor Brightman, when he retires a few years hence; for now, twenty-five years after the publication of his well-known *Introduction to Philosophy*, a revised edition is in public demand. So he has the satisfaction of bringing his famous version of "personalism" down to date in a new edition which will be taught by his many students, and will hold the interest of philosophical readers in general for years to come.

Brightman's immediate spiritual ancestor was Borden Parker Bowne, "American founder and popularizer of *personalism* (1847-1910) who held that *reality* consists of a society of *interacting person*, depending on the Supreme *Person, God*, yet relatively free" (p. 322). This is also Brightman's position, although in many details he has

developed this philosophy more profoundly and comprehensively. The common spiritual ancestor of both Bowne and Brightman is, of course, George Berkeley. Like the good bishop, they affirm that *esse* is always either *percipi* or *percipere*; all that exist are persons and their ideas. This position unqualifiedly denied the existence of matter in Berkeley's time, and hence was believed by his followers (he had a few) to refute materialism, atheism, and skepticism, and to render the existence of God even more certain to every man than that of his fellow human beings. As revised by Bowne and Brightman and their school personalism (often called "personal idealism") is claimed to refute all the philosophical heresies of our own time, such as neorealism, pragmatism, existentialism, and logical positivism.

The personalists are clearly on the side of the angels. Their religious orthodoxy is irreproachable, at least from an Arminian standpoint. In order to meet the problem of evil, to be sure, Brightman (apparently influenced by such philosophers as J. S. Mill, William James, and Hastings Rashdall) supposes that the power of God must be limited in some respects.

If my memory is correct, I have heard Brightman affirm that no one has ever succeeded in showing that personalism is an impossible philosophy. This claim of course is true. But, alas! What type of philosophy except completely unqualified skepticism, has ever been conclusively refuted? From Berkeley's time until now personalism has always had eminent supporters, although it has never been the most favored philosophy. To do Brightman justice, nowhere in this book does he profess to refute rival philosophies, although he expresses frank dislike of realism and naturalism. He consistently endeavors to set forth fairly the principal arguments for each position, and to allow the reader to decide for himself which to accept.

The original edition of this book was probably primarily intended for undergraduates taking a first course in philosophy (mostly of course sophomores), and it has been excellent for this purpose. The new edition, approximately of the same length, covers many more details in a more condensed and technical manner. It seems likely to make its principal appeal to somewhat more mature readers, although it does not presuppose any previous acquaintance with philosophy.

WILLIAM K. WRIGHT

New Birth, by Bernhard Citron, Edinburgh, University Press, 1951, pp. xvi, 215, 21/.

The subtitle of this book is "A Study of the Evangelical Doctrine of Conversion in the Protestant Fathers." The author, born in Berlin in 1905 to Jewish parents and in early life a freethinker, during a period in Budapest came to an experience which he later identified as conversion. In 1939 he began theological studies at New College, University of Edinburgh, and entered the ministry of the Church of Scotland.

The book represents the author's doctoral dissertation and gives evidence of sound scholarship and painstaking study. Complete footnotes identify all sources. Appended to the volume is a competent bibliography, together with indexes of Bible passages referred to in the text, the names of persons referred to, and subject headings.

This particular study on the doctrine of conversion arose out of the conviction that one's "own little experience is part of the universal experience of the church." The author traces the pilgrimage of the soul "from the darkness of his pre-conversion days to the life eternal." Conversion is treated in the terms of biblical revelation and is represented as beginning on God's initiative, but effected coöperatively by the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Conversion is not to Christianity, but to Christ. There is a strong emphasis upon the Bible, which is seen as "the drama of the conversion of the world . . . of the return of man to God."

In his analyses of the various concepts and descriptions of spiritual processes the author draws continually upon the Confessional standards of the Lutheran and Reformed churches, and frequently though briefly quotes Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Zwingli, Wesley, Witherspoon, Witsius, Hodge, Barth, and others.

The author presents a stimulating description of the pre-dawn preparation for conversion on the part of the unconverted which is definitely a work of grace. Conversion may be sudden or gradual. The book devotes one chapter to an analysis of each step in the converted man's pilgrimage from the standpoint of historical dogma, *viz.*, faith, repentance, the new will, baptism, sanctification (new pattern of life), a lifelong struggle, assurance, and union with Christ. The "life everlasting" represents the last stages of conversion, the progress of the soul even beyond death.

Within the area of the history of Christian doctrine this book makes a distinct contribution at the point of clarifying the approach of the Reformers and certain eminent Protestant theologians to the experience of conversion. It is conditioned throughout by a conservative tradition rooted in biblical revelation as qualified by the basic tenets of Reformed theology. The book is disappointing in its lack of originality in treatment and a fresh point of view. A traditionalist will find it helpful and rather delightful.

It may be questioned whether the writer's own purpose is fulfilled in the most satisfying manner. He might have served his purpose more fully by elaborating the universal aspects of the conversion experience beyond the simple exposition of source material, and the rather meagre reflections upon the conversion experience of individual church leaders. The idea of treating the doctrine of conversion not primarily as doctrine but experimentally in terms of the collective experience of the Christian church is surely a worthy approach, but the author has hardly made the most of his opportunities at this point. The book is competent and worthy within its defined scope.

J. ARTHUR HECK

Interpreting the Church through Press and Radio, by Roland E. Wolseley, Philadelphia, Muhlenberg Press, ©1951, pp. xv, 352, \$3.75.

This book presents a thorough analysis of the journalistic approach to the interpretation of the church through press and radio. It is an exclusively journalistic slant. It contains a wealth of information that makes for stimulating reading. I did not know there were so many religious groups associated for the purpose of interpreting the church to the people. It throws considerable light on the multiplied avenues through which the life of the church at the local level can be made known to the community. The discussions are sound and reflect considerable experiences in these areas.

There is a chapter on what is to be interpreted and another on the organization necessary for adequate interpretation. Religion in the general press is considered, as well as church journalism on the air. The author points out the part the syndicates play in interpretation. Denominational publications, parish bulletins, and miscellaneous printed materials are all given careful attention. Ministers will be interested in the chapters devoted to the churchman as news writer, as feature and article writer.

The author points out that the public interprets everything pertaining to the church, not waiting for the church to explain itself properly. So the public frequently jumps to unwarranted conclusions. A policy of refusal to acknowledge the need for interpretation presents a difficulty greater than that of meeting the need.

After considering the possibility of failure that hangs heavy over the heads of many denominational publications, the author points out that the Methodist

devotional bi-monthly *The Upper Room* has achieved "the surprising circulation of more than three million copies per issue and has been able to add high profits to its publisher's accounts" (p. 47). These proceeds were used to buy a tall Nashville office building (p. 126).

The position the author holds is that generally speaking the public (including church people) will not or cannot support the highest type of secular newspaper or magazine. And yet the church depends more upon the press than the press does upon the church.

Denominational publications are taken to task. Insistence is made of the fact that "few religious magazines and newspapers can stand comparison with the newsstand publications which are their actual competitors" (p. 122). It was interesting to note that "five out of every six Southern Baptists take no Baptist paper" (p. 124). The personnel of the editorial side of church publications are generally untrained in journalistic techniques. In some instances they have been given their assignments because their denominations can find no other place for them. The need for professional editorial skill is disregarded, and the only qualification for the position is that this man is a minister who has served a few churches and is willing to work for a very modest salary. Better denominational publications will come when the need for skilled personnel is recognized. Such personnel should not be required to make speeches or conduct services or solicit advertising. The author concludes that denominational publications cannot raise their standards higher than the controlling boards or readers will permit.

The field of radio and television is covered in a wholesome but very limited way. He suggests that "money spent on all media may provide a sounder interpretation of the church than concentration of funds in any one" (p. 95). Religious programs on the air usually indicate poor workmanship. This is true in script writing, disregard for time limitations, singing, and general production. Quite pointedly the author contends that "A minister should not expect a radio station to surrender time unconditionally any more than he should expect a newspaper or magazine editor to leave a blank space for him to fill as he wishes each week" (p. 195). Variety in religious radio and television programming is supported.

There are a few minor criticisms to be made. The sentence structure is sometimes quite confusing. Witness this one: "Added to these groups are the products of the denominationally maintained offices, such as that of the director of publicity of the National Lutheran Council, Southern Baptist Convention, which sends out news stories under the name Baptist Press, or the Large Methodist Information office and others referred to in earlier chapters" (pp. 112 f.). That sentence makes no sense at all. The author would do well to follow the new journalistic and radio style of writing in short sentences.

Here are a few errors. It should be "Lamp Unto My Feet" not "Lantern Unto My feet" (p. 100). The Joint Religious Radio Committee was absorbed by the Protestant Radio Commission; it never existed apart from the Commission (p. 37). "Satisfy" for "satisfy" (p. 118). "Mrs. Colewell" for Mrs. Colwell" (p. 91). These are all very minor errors.

In summary I would heartily commend this book for the library of every denominational and interdenominational executive. The minister of the local church would find considerable resource materials in it. The appendices offer a press chairman's manual, a public relation plan in outline, a style sheet, a press and radio glossary, and a bibliography. All of these are full of very valuable information to which the would-be interpreter of the church through the press and radio will wish to refer often.

CHARLES H. SCHMITZ

BOOK NOTICES

The Babylonian Genesis, by Alexander Heidel, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2nd. ed., ©1951, pp. xi, 153, and 17 figures, \$3.50.

The Babylonian creation epic, known from its initial two words as *Enuma Elish*, is one of the longer and more important religious writings of the ancient Near East. Its text of approximately 1,000 lines can now be almost completely restored and translated as a result of the cumulative contributions of a number of cuneiformists in the course of the past three quarters of a century. From time to time throughout these years translations of the entire available text of the poem were prepared with various degrees of success. In 1942, Alexander Heidel, a member of the Assyrian Dictionary staff of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, published an up-to-the-minute and highly trustworthy translation of the poem in a book entitled *The Babylonian Genesis*. The present volume is a revised, improved, and somewhat enlarged edition of that work. The book consists of three chapters and an appendix. The first chapter begins with a very brief introduction outlining the story of the discovery and publication of the original tablets on which the epic is inscribed, its purpose and character, its source, date of composition, and formal structure. The remainder of the chapter is devoted to a highly literal, line-by-line translation of the poem. The second chapter is devoted to a translation of the numerous other creation texts current in Babylonia, including the well-known excerpts from Damascus and Berossus. In the third chapter Heidel makes a comparative analysis of the cosmological concepts of the Babylonians and those of the Hebrews in order to see if, and to what extent, the biblical passages which seem to parallel the Babylonian material are dependent on Babylonian sources, "and what implications this may have for questions of religious faith." The appendix contains translations of three Babylonian poems which do not deal with creation, but whose contents Heidel had found necessary to discuss in his chapter on Old Testament parallels. The book closes with a group of plates containing seventeen illustrations pertinent in one way or another to the *Enuma Elish* epic, and a simplified map of the ancient Near East. All in all, Heidel's book is a careful and up-to-date compendium of translations of the Babylonian creation texts, and except for some rather dubious excursions into dogma, should prove highly useful to the interested student and scholar who is not a cuneiform specialist.

SAMUEL NOAH KRAMER

The Return from Babel, by Gerald M. Spring, New York, Philosophical Library, ©1951, pp. xxvi, 188, \$3.50.

This author's purpose is to indicate a way of escape from the confused Babel of contemporary thought and life, especially in political and economic matters. He has read widely and cites many recent and contemporary authorities, who have written in English, French, and German, quoting most often from Jules de Gaultier, Maurice Barrès, André Gide, and Hans Kohn. He believes that we have overemphasized the importance of nations and have not realized the significance of differences between the regions of each country, and between races. So we greatly need interpreters who will enable regions and races to appreciate one another, without desiring fusion. He thinks that our American national constitution is out of date, and that a convention should be called to work out a new federal system based on regions instead of States. He desires our middle class to become articulate and no longer to allow

socialists and communists to be the only thinkers to propose reforms. He has evidently read widely, thoughtfully, and discriminatingly. This book is worth studying.

WILLIAM K. WRIGHT

Monk in Armor, by Gladys H. Barr, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, ©1948 and 1950, pp. 256, \$3.

Monk in Armor is one more in the long line of historical novels. The writer portrays Luther as a very human figure who seeks and ultimately finds peace with God and, though he did not search for it, domestic happiness. Mrs. Barr reveals a considerable knowledge of Luther's life and times, but some of the scenes appear improbable if not impossible. An example of this is to be seen in the picture of Tetzel refusing an indulgence to a widow who had no money with which to buy her son's release from purgatory. Actually the machinery of indulgences—bad as it was—provided that those with nothing should supply their contribution with prayer and fasting. The author wisely concludes the story of Luther's life with his marriage and thus avoids those later years when he was attacking one group after another. *Monk in Armor* is good reading, but it needs the corrective of a scholarly volume such as Bainton's *Here I Stand*.

RAYMOND J. BEAN

John Knox's History of the Reformation in Scotland, edited by William Croft Dickinson, New York, Philosophical Library, ©1950, 2 vols., pp. cix, 374, 498, \$15.

John Knox was the only man closely connected with the Reformation to write a history, but most students of church history have a better knowledge of the Reformation in England and on the continent than in Scotland. This edition of John Knox's *History of the Reformation in Scotland* will go a long way toward correcting this situation. The reformer's work is exceedingly valuable, but differences in language make it difficult for the modern reader to study his account of the Scottish Reformation. We are greatly indebted to Dr. Dickinson because he has made it possible for the average reader to understand both the terms and the references employed by Knox. Frequent footnotes enable the student to understand the words and allusions which would otherwise be difficult or even meaningless. Some passages in the original text (which were not the work of Knox but were included as documentary evidence) have been placed in appendices in the latter half of the second volume. This makes for smoother reading while still preserving the value of these sections. In addition, a glossary of terms is included as well as a very complete index covering 146 pages. It will be many years before this edition will be outdated.

RAYMOND J. BEAN

Humanism as a Philosophy, by Corliss Lamont, New York, Philosophical Library, 3rd ed., [©1949], pp. xxii, 368, \$3.75.

The third edition of Corliss Lamont's *Humanism as a Philosophy* contains little new save a preface. Aside from a few remarks about criticisms made against the early editions, the preface contributes a list of metaphysical categories for humanism. Interestingly enough, no mention is made of the criticisms of Mr. Lamont's attitude toward present-day Marxist philosophy and practice in the Soviet Union. The text still retains the woefully inadequate statement of Marx's thought and remains strangely insensitive to Stalinist practice. He does eliminate the statement that Marxists are properly included among democratic humanists. In its place he voices doubts about communist nations putting into effect "the true Marxist theory" of

democracy. Even with this concession, however, Mr. Lamont's benign attitude toward Marxist theory and practice still gives cause for serious concern to democratic humanists. Aside from this exceedingly serious blindness, the book remains a readable, though sketchy, statement of a humanist's philosophy.

KEITH MC GARY

Mission to America, by Truman B. Douglas, New York, Friendship Press, ©1951, pp. 151, \$2.

The author is disturbed because the "American Way of Life," as we know it today, is far removed from the course envisioned by our forefathers "when they articulated the fundamental principles of American life." It is the author's feeling that "Those principles have no sympathy with any system of caste, in which a man's importance and standing are measured by the number of people he can look down upon." But not only has this American Way slipped from its original American moorings, but its present structure reveals "how wide is the gulf between the current estimate of greatness and the Christian proclamation concerning what is of worth in the sight of God!" The influence of a secularized society is so strong that some people cannot distinguish between the voice of the community and the voice of God. Now in the midst of this rather depressing state of affairs there are two encouraging factors: first, in America there is yet sufficient air of freedom for people to get their breath and move around without being strait-jacketed by a totalitarian government; the second encouraging factor is the Christian church, which, the author contends, is the most underrated power for good in the world today. The church is the sleeping giant of this generation. The Christian church, to Mr. Douglas, is the remnant of loyal people in all our denominations—the God-committed, Christ-possessed. And it is these people who must lead the mission to America. *Mission to America* has a fresh approach, is written in a lucid style, and its theme—winning America to Christ through the community of true believers—is consistently developed from start to finish.

W. WESLEY SHRADER

A Method of Prayer, by Johannes Kelpius, edited by E. Gordon Alderfer, New York, Harper, ©1951, pp. 127, \$1.50.

Johannes Kelpius (ca. 1673-1708) was the leader of a band of German Protestant recluses who lived "a most austere and ascetic existence" among "the wild and rocky glens along the Wissahickon," within the confines of present-day metropolitan Philadelphia. E. Gordon Alderfer edits for us Kelpius' short work on internal prayer, a piece which has been virtually unknown for two centuries. More than half the present volume is taken up by the editor himself in an informative and illuminating essay on Kelpius and his environment. Then we have in fifty-two short pages the work itself. It teaches the necessity and the method of the prayer of silence, of self-emptying, of wordless contemplation—the life that is one long prayer without ceasing. As the editor hints, it has something in common with Brother Lawrence's widely read tract, which came from about the same period. Reader, do not buy this book for its pretty golden jacket. Buy it only if you want to go deeper into "inward prayer" and are willing to pay more than a dollar and a half for your instruction. One must live with this little volume before really possessing its heart. In this age of sensate culture, of television and the comics, of the jet-plane and the hell-bomb, it is harder than ever to burrow into the older spiritual teachers. But O so much the more imperative!

JOHN W. BRUSH

D. H. Lawrence and Human Existence, by William Tiverton, New York, Philosophical Library, ©1951, pp. xv, 140, \$3.

The author, a priest of the Anglican Church, does not succeed in what he apparently wanted to do. He does not prove that D. H. Lawrence was a Christian. One finds it hard to understand why the attempt should have been made. However, he succeeds notably in setting forth the honest genius of Lawrence in an unforgettable manner. That Lawrence was essentially a religious figure, as the author and T. S. Eliot, writer of the preface, agree, is a matter for endless debate. Filled with extensive and well-chosen quotations from Lawrence's writings, with skillful accompanying comment, this book has decidedly an adequate introduction.

HARMON M. GEHR

The Children We Teach, by Elizabeth S. Whitehouse, Philadelphia, Judson, ©1950, pp. 304, \$2.50.

This is a book on child psychology written in a nontechnical vocabulary. It should be valuable for the average parent and church-school teacher in helping to understand children and their religious development. It would serve as an excellent text for a standard leadership course in the area of child study. The coverage of the general field is good. The author begins with methods by which one can know children and goes on to discuss the general needs and interests as well as their individual differences. The emphasis on inherited traits is incorrect, according to this reviewer. There is a good general statement of the emotional and religious growth of children, and there are several excellent practical suggestions on guiding children in helping them to develop Christian character. This book will answer in nontechnical terms many of the questions parents and church-school teachers have about the religious training of the younger child.

CHARLES E. BATTEN

Living as Comrades, by Daniel Johnson Fleming, New York, Agricultural Mission, 1950, pp. xii, 180, \$1.50.

This book deals with two difficult questions: 1. how should a dedicated Christian live in order to identify himself most effectively with those whom he wishes to serve; 2. how shall he live so as to help establish the community of Christians within the various cultures that make up the human family. The author draws upon his own long and rich experience and upon the experience of many others with whom he has had intimate acquaintance. He brings together the testimony of hundreds covering practically every part of the world. Obviously he finds no easy answer and no set rules. We do not, in fact, know how Jesus lived, but we do know that he suffered no barriers to exist between himself and those who sought his help and whom he sought to serve. The book helps us to realize as we should that the spread of communism has added new and critical dimensions to these problems. The aim of the Christian who wants to go all the way should, however, be clear as the author points out in "Resources for Dilemmas." He should seek "to accomplish the most that is of lasting worth with the minimum of waste in time, effort and materials." The trouble comes, as he adds, from conflicting values. It is truly a part of the Christian program to lift the standard of living—the physical, not for itself alone but for the sake of the spiritual. The most helpful testimonies are those that reveal the spirit of brotherhood and the willingness to make one's method of living in school, church, hospital, and home, a constant witness to Christ and the transforming power of his love. It is a book calculated to trouble the conscience of any sensitive Christian. It will not so much tell him what to do as help him to realize that he ought to do more to be a builder of that sacramental and sacrificial community "within society" which the first Christians called "The Way."

E. C. HERRICK

Free to Grow, by Blanche Carrier, New York, Harper, ©1951, pp. vii, 241, \$3.

The author, who received her doctorate at Teachers College, Columbia, has spent her professional life in college teaching, city churches, weekday schools of religion, and extensive lecturing. The contents of Dr. Carrier's book are aptly described by the title. Its subject matter is both comprehensive and succinct, intelligently presented and stimulating in its reasoned conclusion. Applying the sound results of modern psychology, in which she shows a wide knowledge, to the field of her investigation, the writer demonstrates the validity and value of the discoveries of psychology for the enrichment and ennobling of Christian personality and the total integration of the beloved community as it was envisioned and exemplified by Jesus Christ. Contemporary life with its seething frustrations and psychotic maladjustments, driving youth and adult alike to irrational behavior, is the stage on which the writer introduces the redeeming dynamic of Christian morality and insight. Many directional mediums are offered by which the goal of a beautiful life may be achieved; yet one discerns in the reading of this useful book that they are all inherent in the primary and basal indispensability of emotional stability. This consideration, like a silken thread, runs throughout the whole book, giving continuity to the subject. It is further enhanced by thoroughly applicable and illuminating illustrations. The ten chapters comprising the book are like steps in an ascending scale of the treatment of the subject matter. Space does not permit the inclusion of all of them, just a few: "How Personality Affects Spiritual Life," "Why We Are Unable to Solve Our Problems," "How to Make Religious Ideals Realistic," "Worship as a Door to Power," "Ways of Commitment." This book read, marked, learned, and inwardly digested, will add a cubit to one's knowledge of himself.

AUGUSTUS D. WHITNEY, JR.

Man: Mind or Matter, Charles Mayer, translated by Harold A. Larrabee, Boston, Beacon, 1951, pp. 168, \$2.50.

"This book is an attempt to set forth a renovated and rejuvenated philosophy of rationalistic materialism," so Charles Mayer, French materialist, begins the preface of his book. He advances the ideas of materialism already known to modern man. He declares the virtues of man and points out the power of man to achieve. The arguments are not new—but are a reaction to religion built on absolutes and authority. Virtues are the result of man's striving alone; there is no room for God or the "spirits leading." To me there is no room in our world for a philosophy which takes away all authority and turns to man as the highest good. This book has little to say that I have not heard before and in a far better way. It simply makes me want to know more of the way of God in Christ Jesus. Some will find it interesting and "enjoyable"; for others it will be a waste of time; for me it was a book to review. Materialism has contributed much to physical life; yet life based on materialism alone is helpless, hopeless, and dead. The book is well written. The author knows his field—the one side—and argues well.

ALLEN B. STANGER

The Heresy of Jacob Hobbs, by Raymond Durbin Miller, New York, Exposition Press, ©1951, pp. 125, \$2.50.

Although the title-page calls this book "a novel," it is not to be classed with the religious fiction of popular appeal. It is not religion as an excuse for writing a novel, but the novel form used to express a religious conviction. The Reverend Jacob Hobbs is disturbed by the challenge of a disillusioned ministerial student. The loan of a whole

library of theological literature and the association with an almost incredible Catholic priest are the forces that produce his heresy—which is not what one expects. It is heresy only in the sense that few, either conservative or liberal, have attained to its logical and experiential position. Thus it is a novel of ideas rather than of either character or situation. The author, a retired professor of English, writes with great charm and skill, and has presented, in fair and generous treatment, a contest in the arena of Christian theological thought. If Bishop Blougram seems to be a silent guest at some of the discussions, he is certainly entitled to be present. He is in the company of many an unnamed, but identifiable, searcher after the truth about Jesus and Christianity. His thesis about how to conduct oneself both during and after the search is also recognizable in places.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

That They May Have Life, by Daniel T. Niles, New York, Harper, ©1951, pp. 121, \$1.50.

Any testimony to the elemental aspects of the Christian faith which comes from the East is to be welcomed by the West. And when a brilliant young Ceylonese Christian writes concerning evangelism and the church's chief concern, his words ought to be taken seriously. Here are just a few of them:

Evangelism is the proclamation of an event and it is also an invitation to an encounter—an encounter with the risen Christ.

This Gospel is addressed to the world, the primary fact of which is man's lack of faith in his essential dignity.

The evangelist is the instrument of God. Being "separated unto the Gospel" is not something we do, but something God does. The task of the evangelist is the recovery of wholeness; bringing back the lost to their place in the economy of God.

The Church is not only an instrument of the Gospel but part of the Gospel itself.

Evangelism is the way of the Church's life. Evangelistic work is the way the evangelist lives.

The faith that supports evangelism . . . is not a conviction to which men are led by any natural transition of thought; it is rather a fact with which men are challenged and which establishes itself by the revolution it effects.

These are the basic convictions—all derived from a penetrating analysis of Scripture—which form the framework for Dr. Niles' thinking. This is not an argumentative book; yet the subject is well sprinkled with reasoned judgments. It is not proverbially orthodox in its presentation; yet it is not the unusual method that attracts attention. It is a strange, yet delightful, mixture of philosophy, mysticism, and evangelical fervor—a sweet and sour fricassee of cold logic and warm devotion. No better illustration of this rare combination is to be found than in the author's treatment of "the task" of the evangelist. In the intensely practical methodology of proclamation, identification, demonstration, interpretation, and transformation, there shine soft lights of mystical intuition and brilliant rays of philosophical perception. Anyone who takes Christianity and its function seriously will find this book a bulwark to faith and a prod to the witness of it.

ROBERT D. HERSHEY

Applying Philosophy, by Rupert C. Lodge, Boston, Beacon, ©1951, pp. 243, \$2.75.

While everybody probably agrees that some books on philosophy ought to be practical and serve the needs of everyday life, few philosophers know how to write such a book. An exception is the author of this volume, now professor in Queen's University at Kingston, Ontario, who combines Oxford scholarship and vision with North American practicality. He explains what philosophy is, and the indispensable rôles of realism, idealism, and pragmatism in education, business, gov-

ernment, religion, and everyday living. The chapter outlining the three indispensable approaches of philosophy to religion is particularly interesting. The realistic approach takes the scientific view of the world, observing in the course of emergent evolution the different levels of inorganic matter, the lower organisms, human life and society. In this, reference is made to the interpretation by Samuel Alexander in *Space, Time and Deity*. The idealistic approach of philosophy to religion presented in different forms by Plato, Kant, Hegel, and more recent philosophers, is equally essential; without it religion would be liable either to become submerged in positivistic science, or else to become so absorbed in social activities that it would lose its distinctively spiritual outlook altogether. The pragmatic approach to religion is also necessary; for churches should be of service in everyday living. Here discussion is concerned chiefly with the pragmatism [instrumentalism] of the school of John Dewey, in which the books by E. S. Ames are significant. Professor Lodge seems right in treating realism, idealism, and pragmatism as the only philosophies at present essential in such a study as he has undertaken. Existentialism, whether that of Kierkegaard or Sartre, can at present be ignored. While the time probably will come when the philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead must be taken into account in a work of this character, this will not be the case until Whitehead's real thought has become more clearly determined by the commentators than is the situation today.

WILLIAM K. WRIGHT

Dearly Beloved, by M. G. Nicola, New York, Exposition Press, ©1951, pp. 205, \$3.

Here is another preacher novel—that is, one of and by a minister. There is nothing sensational about it: it is not a burlesque or caricature, and it is not written with either acid or honey. Accordingly, it will likely be spared the fate of becoming a best seller; but it is interesting reading and should prove attractive to folk of the intelligence to be leery of the stuff which makes too big a cleverly engineered splash. The hero of the story—really it is scarcely a “story,” to say nothing of a novel—is an elderly Episcopal rector who has retired to the town of his boyhood in the Western Reserve. From his sickbed and wheel chair he is able to understand and straighten out several tangles—which many a churchman will think a straight account of muddles in his own church. And constantly the winsome old gentleman is musing over not dissimilar situations in his own active ministry. I enjoyed reading the book and recommend it cordially.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

Freedom in Action: Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, by Peter R. Ackroyd, London, Independent Press, ©1951, pp. 84, 3/6.

A book, simply written and of sufficiently brief compass to prove useful to laymen. It follows conventional lines, presents nothing new nor startling; its meagre bibliography, entirely of English titles, could be enriched by the addition of H. J. Cadbury's *The Making of Luke-Acts* and John Knox's *Chapters in a Life of Paul*. Both these books would serve to point out the undubitable fact that the conventional treatment of Acts has been challenged at vital points.

MARY E. ANDREWS

Vedanta for Modern Man, edited by Christopher Isherwood, New York, Harper, ©1945-1951, pp. xiv, 410, \$5.

This is a selection of sixty-one brief essays drawn from the magazine *Vedanta and the West*, published under auspices of the San Francisco and Los Angeles Vedanta

Centres. The evident purpose is to make Vedanta philosophy known in relatively simple and understandable terms. Distinguished names appear among the authors. Aldous Huxley, Gerald Heard, James Bissett Pratt, Hubert Benoit, Guido Ferrando, and Alan Watts are among the Westerners represented. Rabindranath Tagore, Jawaharlal Nehru, and Swamis Nikhilananda, Akhilananda, Prabhavananda, Turiyananda, and Vivekananda are eminent among the writers representing India. The essays are the fruit of both thought and spiritual experience. In subject matter they vary according to the authors' interests, but all are variations on the ancient and perennial theme of the Upanishads, man's need to realize his oneness with God. Their descriptions of the way to the great consummation, however, are in the modern man's universe of discourse. Great utterances from the mystical literature of both East and West abound in these pages, but reasons are also given for basic insights, and appeal is steadily made to personal experiment with truth. One can understand why Albert Schweitzer has said that in India we have the mysticism that is logically perfect. Seekers after peace of mind will find here much wisdom concerning cultivation of the higher life. Readers already familiar with Indian thought will be grateful for this expression of it in an anthology of representative recent writings. Christians, though they may not feel at home with the ultimate impersonalism of Vedantic thought, may find valuable suggestions to deepen insight into meanings of their own faith.

CLARENCE H. HAMILTON

The Great Thinkers, by Rupert C. Lodge, Boston, Beacon Press, ©1949, pp. x, 310, \$3.

Trained in great British and German universities, Professor Rupert Lodge settled in the new world and has held various distinguished positions as a teacher of philosophy in the United States and Canada. He is a man of large philosophical learning and a competent knowledge of general literature. He writes in a style full of energy and clarity and with a brightness which in unguarded moments just escapes being smart. His mind is so rich and many-sided that when he comes to write a series of studies of great philosophical thinkers the result is anything but a conventional summary. Indeed he conducts a series of personal adventures among the philosophical masterpieces. He uses his sources with skill, and his work is always illuminating and sometimes very provocative. There will be those who will think that his treatment of Spinoza might have been more sharply critical, that he gives to Plotinus rather more than his day in court, and that Hume might with justice have been subjected to a more devastating analysis. The mind of Professor Lodge is eclectic and it may be suggested that he provides a friendly lodging for minds which really do not get along very well together. Though obviously a person of general benevolence and good will, Professor Lodge writes without moral or spiritual passion. He seems to view Christianity with a sort of genial and friendly aloofness. There are a good many people who feel that for the good of their own minds they must go through one or two volumes essentially covering the whole history of philosophy each year. For such persons *The Great Thinkers* would form an excellent choice for 1951. The great arguments of philosophy are always important and never more significant than when many people are inclined to ignore them. A whole lifetime of philosophic thought and meditation has gone into the making of Professor Lodge's book, and the reader will be led happily into regions where the ultimate problems receive thoughtful consideration.

LYNN HAROLD HOUGH

The Kingdom of Jesus, by John Dashiell Stoops, New York, Philosophical Library, ©1951, pp. xxiv, 172, \$3.75.

If you are looking for objective scholarship, this book will be a disappointment; if you are interested in some of the results of biblical study fitted into a particular theological system, this book will prove worth your while. After a brief word about contemporary philosophical and theological thought, the author states that his purpose is "to focus the ethical and social teaching of Jesus and to discriminate this teaching from the larger theological complex in which it is presented in our New Testament" (p. xxiv). Basically this book is another attempt to separate the Jesus of history from the Christ of faith. In it there is a mixture of philosophy, theology, psychology, biology, biblical study, and occasional verbal illustrations. The work reflects the wide range of study and reading from the author's years as teacher and preacher. While it is obvious that pure objectivity in New Testament study is an impossibility, one has the feeling that here the author has let his philosophical orientation color his critical and historical interpretations beyond the claim of "objectivity." The result is a study of the Christian faith and records that serves to substantiate the author's concept of Jesus as teaching primarily a social gospel of a kingdom or community of righteousness. One may or may not agree with this particular concept of the social gospel, but it is almost impossible to avoid some criticism of the way in which the New Testament records are made to support it.

P. S. ELLIS, JR.

The Romance of Doorbells, by Eugene Dinsmore Dolloff, Philadelphia, Judson, ©1951, pp. 199, \$2.50.

We should allow ourselves to be led into the temptations of this book before we become any deeper confirmed in the faith that we do not have time for "just ordinary pastoral calls." Of course, by the time we have prepared sermons, read two books a week, spoken at two or three luncheon clubs, attended church organization meetings and denominational committees, we have little time left. We may distribute this time among the most worthy cases coming to us for personal guidance, and the most beneficial community agencies needing ministerial representations. We have some time for the council of churches and the ministerial groups of the city. Surely, the personal social life and family life must take the other hours. Well, this is commendable. However, Dr. Dolloff appears to have followed right along with us and then added a tremendous amount of fruitful home-to-home calling. The book is never didactic, but one feels an increasing amount of self-accusation. Not that the reader pities the people upon whom he has not called; rather, he is aware of the wisdom and inspiration he has failed to find because it was "beyond the doors of welcome where he had never knocked."

F. RAYMOND BAKER

BOOKS RECEIVED

Books scheduled for review are not included in this list.

The Life and Morals of Jesus of Nazareth, by Thomas Jefferson, edited by Henry Wilder Foote, Boston, Beacon, 1951, pp. 151, \$2.75.

This is an intelligently edited and beautifully printed edition of Jefferson's famous volume, frequently miscalled "The Jefferson Bible." For all who do not know at first hand the book, this new edition, with its admirable introduction by Dr. Foote, will be a fascinating discovery; for those who do, it will be a valuable addition to their collection of Jeffersoniana.

A Watchman on the Wall, by Wilbur M. Smith, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1951, pp. 191, \$2.50.

A eulogistic "life story" of the late Will H. Houghton.

Interpreters Needed, by Edward Hughes Pruden, Philadelphia, Judson ©1951, pp. 128, \$2.

A gathering of eleven sermons by the pastor of the First Baptist Church, Washington, D. C.

The Life of Jesus in the Words of the Four Gospels, by Edward F. Cary, Poughkeepsie (N. Y.), priv. pr., no date, pp. 224, 25 cents.

This "composite of the four composites" is made from a new translation by the author. Those who desire may obtain it from the author ("24 Garfield") in board covers or cloth bound at 50 cents and \$1 respectively. The opening and closing words of the preface are "Read it, friend, read it!"

The Sovereignty of God and the Word of God, by E. L. Allen, New York, Philosophical Library, ©1951, pp. 45.

Freedom in God, by E. L. Allen, New York, Philosophical Library, ©1951, pp. 43.

Creation and Grace, by E. L. Allen, New York, Philosophical Library, ©1951, pp. 46.

The Self and Its Hazards, by E. L. Allen, New York, Philosophical Library, ©1951, pp. 45.

Christian Humanism, by E. L. Allen, New York, Philosophical Library, ©1951, pp. 46.

Christianity and Society, by E. L. Allen, New York, Philosophical Library, ©1951, pp. 45.

These six little paper-covered booklets (\$5 for the set) claim to be "A guide to the thought" of Barth, Berdyaev, Brunner, Jaspers, Maritain, and R. Niebuhr respectively. For people who have heard of these names but have not read their work, they will serve as general orientation, but they must be read with a warning that they over simplify the thought of the several authors considerably.

Marriage and the Jewish Tradition, edited by Stanley R. Brav, New York, Philosophical Library, ©1951, pp. xiii, 218, \$3.75.

The material reprinted in this volume (all of which has appeared previously) is a conglomeration of popular history, homiletics, practical advice, and exhortation.

The Old Ship Meeting House of Hingham, Massachusetts, by Gladys Stark, Boston, Beacon, 1951, pp. 32, \$1.

To all interested in Americana, and in particular the story of old churches, this little booklet will prove most acceptable, for "Old Ship" is one of the very few so-called "unique churches" which is really unique. Attractive illustrations by Edgar T. P. Walker add to the value of the work.

"*Mr. Anonymous*," by Herbert C. Cornuelle, Caldwell (Ida.), Caxton Printers, 1951, pp. 212, \$4.

A history of the life and times of William Volker, a secretive and little known philanthropist who founded the William Volker Charities Fund. The author is liaison officer for the fund, and understandably prejudiced in favor of his subject.

A Faggot of Torches, by F. W. Boreham, Philadelphia, Judson, ©1926, 1951, pp. 268, \$2.

Another reprinted volume of sermons from favorite texts by the Australian preacher.

ANNUAL INDEX

I

ARTICLES

- Aldwinckle, R. F. (*After Humanism—What?*), 97
 Anderson, George C. (*Where the Church Fails*), 54
 Buri, Fritz (*Old and New Liberalism in Swiss Theology*), 227
 Chester, Allan G. (*Hugh Latimer at Cambridge*), 306
 Cope, Gilbert (*The Kingdom—When and Where?*), 232
 Cranston, Earl (*Religion and Revolution in Asia*), 289
 Davis, Forest K. (*Communism as Religion*), 217
 Davis, George W. (*Liberalism and a Theology of Depth*), 193
 Foote, Henry W. (*Danger and Opportunity*), 1
 Goodenough, Erwin R. (*The Place of Religion in the Treatment of the Mentally Deficient*), 120
 Hudson, Winthrop S. (*Henry Scougal: Gentle Revolutionist*), 45
 Hyatt, J. Philip (*The Ministry of Scholarship*), 212
 King, Winston L. (*Minister's Monday Morning*), 116
 Mackie, Alexander (*Their Nursery Endearments*), 240
 Middleton, Robert G. (*Pastors and Prophets*), 33
 Otto, M. C. (*After Humanism—Humanism*), 104
 Schaeffer, Charles E. (*A Case Study in Church Mergers*), 319
 Schmitz, Charles H. (*Television: Vision or Subdivision*), 333
 Shero, L. R. (*"Totalitarian Sparta"*), 13
 Stevenson, Robert (*J. S. Bach's "Appeals to Cæsar"*), 127

Book Notices: 88, 180, 277, 371. *See Index II*

Book Reviews: 63, 142, 249, 347. *See Index II*

Books Received: 192, 288, 380

From Off the Campus and On: 61, 140, 247, 345

Where Ignorance Is Bliss, 'Tis Folly: 59, 138, 245, 343

II

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

The reviews are arranged alphabetically by authors. The names of the reviewers (in parentheses) follow the titles.

- Aaron, Daniel, *Men of Good Hope* (H. B. SCHOLEFIELD), 263
 Ackroyd, P. R., *Freedom in Action* (M. E. ANDREWS), 377
 Adamastor, *White Man Boss* (D. J. FLEMING), 260
 Allis, O. T., *The Unity of Isaiah* (I. G. MATTHEWS), 191
 Arndt, E. J. F. (ed.), *The Heritage of the Reformation* (R. D. HERSHEY), 82
 Baillie, John, *The Belief in Progress* (ANDREW BANNING), 353
 Bainton, Roland, *Here I Stand* (R. J. BEAN), 362
 Barclay, W. C., *Early American Methodism: 1769-1844* (R. E. E. HARKNESS), 146
 Barr, G. H., *Monk in Armor* (R. J. BEAN), 372
 Batal, James, *Assignment: Near East* (W. M. MORRIS), 188
 Baynes, C. F. (ed.), *The I Ching* (J. K. SHRYOCK), 86
 Beltz, A. G., *Truth of Life* (W. K. WRIGHT), 287
 Bernstein, P. F., *Jew-Hate as a Sociological Problem* (S. V. MC CASLAND), 257
 Bixler, J. S., *A Faith that Fulfills* (W. L. SPERRY), 347
 Blanshard, Paul, *Communism, Democracy, and Catholic Power* (M. S. ENSLIN), 348
 Bokser, B. Z., *The Legacy of Maimonides* (S. S. COHON), 274

- Bosley, H. A., *A Firm Faith for Today* (P. A. BERTOCCHI), 168
 Bowen, Jr., R. LeB., *The Early Arabian Necropolis of Ain Jawan* (J. W. FLIGHT), 366
 Brightman, E. S., *An Introduction to Philosophy* (W. K. WRIGHT), 367
 Burch, G. B., *Early Medieval Philosophy* (A. C. OUTLER), 281
 Burke, M. L., *Origin of History as Metaphysic* (W. K. WRIGHT), 96
 Burkhart, R. A., *The Secret of Life* (E. C. HERRICK), 93
 Buswell, Jr., J. O., *The Philosophies of F. R. Tennant and John Dewey* (E. S. BRIGHTMAN), 249
 Cannon, W. R., *The Redeemer* (P. H. IGARASHI), 283
 Carrier, Blanche, *Free to Grow* (A. D. WHITNEY, JR.), 375
 Chapiro, José, *Erasmus and Our Struggle for Peace* (EARL CRANSTON), 159
 Chaturvedi, Benarsidas, and Sykes, Marjorie, *Charles Freer Andrews* (C. H. HAMILTON), 188
 Chisholm, Emily (ed.), *The Quiet Way* (J. W. BRUSH), 185
 Christopher, A. B., *The Word Accomplished* (H. M. GEHR), 190
 Citron, Bernhard, *New Birth* (J. A. HECK), 368
 Clark, T. C. (ed.), *Today Is Mine* (J. H. IVEY), 94
 Crompton, Arnold, *Apostle of Liberty* (E. C. STARR), 286
 Davies, J. T., *Lord of All* (A. B. STANGER), 280
 De Wolf, L. H., *The Religious Revolt Against Reason* (J. N. HARTT), 76
 Dickinson, W. C., *John Knox's History of the Reformation in Scotland* (R. J. BEAN), 372
 Dinkler, Erich, *Bibelautorität und Bibelkritik* (F. C. GRANT), 183
 Dolloff, E. D., *The Romance of Doorbells* (F. R. BAKER), 379
 Donovan, J. P., *Pelagius and the Fifth Crusade* (M. H. SHEPHERD, JR.), 84
 Douglas, T. B., *Mission to America* (W. W. SHRADER), 373
 Drummond, A. L., *The Church in English Fiction* (L. H. HOUGH), 184
 Einstein, Albert, *Out of My Later Years* (F. H. ROSS), 82
 Elmslie, W. A. L., *How Came Our Faith* (J. B. PRITCHARD), 88
 Ferm, Vergilius (ed.), *A History of Philosophical Systems* (W. K. WRIGHT), 68
 Ferré, N. F. S., *Strengthening the Spiritual Life* (R. E. KEIGHTON), 281
 Ferris, T. P., *Go Tell the People* (H. W. FOOTE), 286
 Fisk, M. P., *The Art of the Rhythmic Choir* (R. E. KEIGHTON), 92
 Fitch, R. E., *The Kingdom without End* (K. L. SMITH), 149
 Fleming, D. J., *Living as Comrades* (E. C. HERRICK), 374
 Fleming, Sanford, *Living Portraits of Jesus* (J. R. BRANTON), 286
 Fodor, Nandor, and Gaynor, Frank, *Freud* (G. W. DAVIS), 287
 Foote, Gaston (ed.), *Communion Meditations* (R. E. KEIGHTON), 189
 Forman, Sidney, *West Point* (R. C. MCDANEL), 285
 Fosdick, H. E., *The Man from Nazareth* (F. W. BEARE), 180
 Fowlie, Wallace, *Pantomime* (THEODORE ENSLIN), 282
 Frank, S. L. (ed.), *A Solovyov Anthology* (W. K. WRIGHT), 262
 Gagey, E. M., *The San Francisco Stage* (R. E. KEIGHTON), 94
 Gandhi's *Letters to a Disciple* (C. H. HAMILTON), 80
 Gingerich, Melvin, *Service for Peace* (J. W. THOMAS), 172
 Goldstein, Morris, *Jesus in the Jewish Tradition* (W. F. STINESPRING), 253
 Goodspeed, E. J., *A Life of Jesus* (F. W. YOUNG), 350
 Guthrie, W. K. C., *The Greek Philosophers* (H. L. CROSBY), 167
 Haecker, Theodor, *Kierkegaard the Cripple* (W. K. WRIGHT), 89
 Harkness, Georgia, *Conflicts in Religious Thought* (ANDREW BANNING), 78
 Through Christ Our Lord (R. E. KEIGHTON), 96
 Havelock, E. A., *The Crucifixion of Intellectual Man* (J. S. BIXLER), 276
 Hay, C. L., *The Blind Spot in American Public Education* (F. R. MOREY), 178
 Hay, Malcolm, *The Foot of Pride* (S. V. MCCASLAND), 63
 Hazelton, Roger, *Renewing the Mind* (H. S. SMITH), 170
 Heard, Gerald, *Is God in History?* (W. K. WRIGHT), 85
 Morals Since 1900 (A. C. KNUDSON), 255
 Heidel, Alexander, *The Babylonian Genesis* (S. N. KRAMER), 371
 Herklots, H. C. G., *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament* (M. E. ANDREWS), 356

- Hershey, R. D., *The Secret of God* (K. B. CULLY), 279
Hiltner, Seward, *Self-Understanding* (C. M. BOND), 366
Hirsch, Emanuel, *Geschichte der neuern evangelischen Theologie* (E. E. AUBREY), 179
Hough, L. H., *The Dignity of Man* (S. L. BLANTON), 95
Howie, C. G., *The Date and Composition of Ezekiel* (I. G. MATTHEWS), 186
Hyma, Albert, *The Brethren of the Common Life* (J. W. BRUSH), 187
Inge, W. R., *Diary of a Dean* (H. P. VAN DUSEN), 75
Isherwood, Christopher (ed.), *Vedanta for Modern Man* (C. H. HAMILTON), 377
Jeffries, J. C., *This Same Jesus* (G. W. DAVIS), 287
Johnson, P. E., *Christian Love* (A. G. WIDGERY), 165
Jones, E. DeW., *The Royalty of the Pulpit* (VAUGHAN DABNEY), 360
Kammerer, Winifred (ed.), *A Coptic Bibliography* (B. M. METZGER), 189
Kaufmann, W. A., *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist* (P. S. MILLER), 161
Kelley, C. F., *The Spirit of Love* (J. W. BRUSH), 258
Kelpius, Johannes, *A Method of Prayer* (J. W. BRUSH), 373
Kennedy, Gerald, *With Singleness of Heart* (F. R. GRIFFIN), 285
Kerr, Jr., H. T., *Positive Protestantism* (ANDREW BANNING), 173
Knudson, A. C., *Basic Issues in Christian Thought* (N. F. S. FERRÉ), 69
Lamont, Corliss, *Humanism as a Philosophy* (KEITH MCGARY), 372
Larrabee, H. A. (ed.), *Man: Mind or Matter* (A. B. STANGER), 375
Lieberman, Saul, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (H. R. WILLOUGHBY), 272
Lietzmann, Hans, *From Constantine to Julian* (R. M. GRANT), 156
Little, K. D., *François de Fénelon* (W. J. GAINES), 359
Lodge, R. C., *Applying Philosophy* (W. K. WRIGHT), 376
 The Great Thinkers (L. H. HOUGH), 378
Lofts Norah, *Women in the Old Testament* (J. B. PRITCHARD), 87
Luccock, H. E. (ed.), *The Best of Dick Sheppard* (R. E. KEIGHTON), 187
Macfarland, C. S., *Christian Unity in the Making* (I. M. ROSE), 88
Mannheim, Karl, *Freedom, Power, and Democratic Planning* (R. L. HIGHTOWER), 66
Marshall, G. N. (ed.), *The Church of the Pilgrim Fathers* (H. W. FOOTE), 189
Martin, H. V., *Kierkegaard, The Melancholy Dane* (W. K. WRIGHT), 185
Mathews, Basil, *Forward Through the Ages* (K. S. LATOURETTE), 270
Maurer, Herrymon (ed.), *The Pendle Hill Reader* (D. J. FLEMING), 177
Maziarz, E. A., *The Philosophy of Mathematics* (W. K. WRIGHT), 91
McGinn, D. J., *The Admonition Controversy* (F. W. BUCKLER), 157
Messer, M. B., *East and West* (C. S. BRADEN), 96
Miedema, Arjen, *Talks with Gabriel* (THEODORE ENSLIN), 183
Miller, R. D., *The Heresy of Jacob Hobbs* (R. E. KEIGHTON), 375
Montagu, Ashley, *Statement on Race* (H. H. STROUP), 266
Morgan, W. S., *The Philosophy of Religion* (G. W. DAVIS), 275
Mould, E. W. K., *Bible History Digest* (D. M. BECK), 79
Murray, Gilbert, *Stoic, Christian, and Humanist* (W. L. SPERRY), 70
Naimy, Mikhail, *Kahlil Gibran* (I. G. MATTHEWS), 184
Nash, A. S. (ed.), *Protestant Thought in the Twentieth Century* (H. T. HOUF), 365
Nicola, M. G., *Dearly Beloved* (M. S. ENSLIN), 377
Niles, D. T., *That They May Have Life* (R. D. HERSHEY), 376
Nixon, J. W., *Responsible Christianity* (D. E. ROBERTS), 74
Ohrn, A. T. (ed.), *Eighth Baptist World Congress* (H. W. SMITH), 181
Oxnam, G. B., *The Church and Contemporary Change* (R. S. CLEMENTS), 169
 On This Rock (R. S. CLEMENTS), 180
Parker, T. M., *The English Reformation to 1558* (F. W. BUCKLER), 181
Paterson, John, *The Praises of Israel* (J. P. HYATT), 352
Pauck, Wilhelm, *The Heritage of the Reformation* (R. C. PETRY), 151
Paul, Leslie, *The Age of Terror* (K. B. CULLY), 280
Petry, R. C., *Preaching in the Great Tradition* (R. M. GREY), 73
Pollard, F. E., et al., *Democracy and the Quaker Method* (R. L. COE), 174
Poteat, E. Mc N., *God Makes the Difference* (L. H. HOUGH), 282
Powell, C. H., *Faith That Moves Mountains* (R. E. KEIGHTON), 286

- Pritchard, J. B. (ed.), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* (ARTHUR JEFFERY), 142
 Reichmann, E. G., *Hostages of Civilisation* (S. V. MC CASLAND), 362
 Rich, Mark, *Rural Prospect* (H. B. WHITE), 89
 Richardson, C. C., *Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist* (R. E. E. HARKNESS), 164
 Rolston, Holmes, *Consider Paul* (M. E. ANDREWS), 265
 Ross, M. G., *Religious Beliefs of Youth* (C. M. BOND), 176
 Rowley, H. H. (ed.), *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy* (W. F. STINESPRING), 148
 Rudy, Esther, *Design for Living* (M. J. COHEN), 191
 Runes, D. D. (ed.), *The Hebrew Impact on Western Civilization* (M. J. COHEN), 269
 Rupp, E. G., *Luther's Progress to the Diet of Worms* (W. S. HUDSON), 268
 Russell, Bertrand, et al., *The Impact of America on European Culture* (H. W. FOOTE), 284
 Sa'd al-Din al-Taftāzāni, *A Commentary on the Creed of Islam* (S. L. SKOSS), 77
 Schmitz, C. H., *Windows Toward God* (R. E. KEIGHTON), 94
 Schoeps, H. J., *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit* (B. M. METZGER), 154
 Theologie und Geschichte des Judentums (H. J. CADBURY), 153
 Scott, E. F., *The Lord's Prayer* (P. S. ELLIS, JR.), 260
 Seaver, George, *Nicholas Berdyaev* (D. V. STEERE), 277
 Shannon, A. C., *The Popes and Heresy in the Thirteenth Century* (R. E. E. HARKNESS), 157
 Shute, J. R., *The Golden Dawn* (A. P. DAVIES), 277
 His Honor the Heretic (A. P. DAVIES), 277
 Smith, C. R., *The Physician Examines the Bible* (I. G. MATTHEWS), 190
 Söderberg, Hans, *La Religion des Cathares* (G. L. KUSTAS), 259
 Sperry, W. L. (ed.), *Classics of Religious Devotion* (J. W. BRUSH), 182
 The Ethical Basis of Medical Practice (JULIAN JOHNSON), 175
 Spring, G. M., *The Return from Babel* (W. K. WRIGHT), 371
 Stewart, H. F. (ed.), *Pascal's Pensées* (W. J. GAINES), 163
 Stoops, J. D., *The Kingdom of Jesus* (P. S. ELLIS, JR.), 379
 Strathmann, E. A., *Sir Walter Raleigh* (R. E. KEIGHTON), 364
 Strong, L. A. G., *The Sacred River* (THEODORE ENSLIN), 251
 Stubbing, G. W., *A Dictionary of Church Music* (H. W. FOOTE), 93
 Sweet, W. W., *The Story of Religion in America* (J. W. BRUSH), 90
 Tekeyan, Charles, *The Big Burlesque* (THEODORE ENSLIN), 92
 Thiele, E. R., *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings* (C. M. COOPER), 357
 Thomas, E. L. (ed.), *The Whole World Singing* (O. R. SELLERS), 278
 Thomas, M. E., *Medieval Skepticism and Chaucer* (R. E. KEIGHTON), 256
 Thurman, Howard, *Deep Is the Hunger* (J. H. IVEY), 186
 Tittle, E. F., *A Book of Pastoral Prayers* (R. E. KEIGHTON), 188
 Tiverton, William, *D. H. Lawrence and Human Existence* (H. M. GEHR), 374
 Torbet, R. G., *A History of the Baptists* (R. J. BEAN), 72
 Torrance, T. F., *The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers* (V. F. POTTLE), 160
 Toynbee, A. J., *War and Civilization* (A. C. BINING), 155
 Van Dusen, H. P., *God in Education* (C. H. MOEHLMAN), 355
 Vööbus, Arthur, *Communism's Challenge to Christianity* (H. W. SMITH), 91
 Waddell, Helen, *Stories from Holy Writ* (J. W. FLIGHT), 169
 Wagner, Hughes, *The Word in Season* (R. E. KEIGHTON), 188
 Wallis, C. L. (ed.), *A Treasury of Sermon Illustrations* (R. E. KEIGHTON), 95
 Watt, Hugh, *John Knox in Controversy* (F. H. ROSS), 284
 Wedel, T. O., *The Christianity of Main Street* (F. H. ROSS), 171
 Whitehouse, E. S., *The Children We Teach* (C. E. BATTEN), 374
 Wilder, A. N., *Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus* (F. W. YOUNG), 254
 Williams, Charles, *The Place of the Lion* (THEODORE ENSLIN), 278
 Williamson, A. A., *Moses* (I. G. MATTHEWS), 191
 Wilson, J. C., *Introducing Islam* (C. S. BRADEN), 94
 Windisch, Hans, *The Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount* (F. C. GRANT), 263
 Wise, C. A., *Pastoral Counseling* (A. F. WARD, JR.), 271
 Wolsley, R. E., *Interpreting the Church through Press and Radio* (C. H. SCHMITZ), 369
 Wood, L. F., *How Love Grows in Marriage* (R. L. HIGHTOWER), 187
 Zerbolt of Zutphen, Gerard, *The Imitation of Christ* (J. W. BRUSH), 95